



3 1761 07040517 0

DR BEARD'S
VIEW OF
ROMANISM.



Presented to the
LIBRARY *of the*
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
by

THE ESTATE OF THE LATE
MARY SINCLAIR

W 2
65-4

THE CONFESSIONAL;

A View of Romanism

IN ITS ACTUAL PRINCIPLES, AIMS, AND WORKINGS, DRAWN
UP CHIEFLY FROM

AUTHORITATIVE PAPAL SOURCES,

AND EARNESTLY RECOMMENDED TO THE DISPASSIONATE CONSIDERA-
TION OF CHRISTENDOM,

BY

JOHN R. BEARD, D.D.

MEDAL STRUCK BY THE POPE TO COMMEMORATE



THE MASSACRE OF THE HUGENOTS.

LONDON :

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL AND CO.,

BOOKSELLERS, PATERNOSTER ROW.

[Copyright and right of translation are reserved.]

MANCHESTER:
ARTHUR BURGESS,
BACK POOL FOLD.



1097448

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.—IDEAS AND AIMS.

	Pages
SECTION 1.—THE CONFSSIONAL—WHAT IT IS AND WHAT IT DOES.....	3-23
" 2. " ITS THEOLOGY	24-37
" 3. " ITS IDEALS.....	37-51
" 4. " ITS ETHICS..	51-73
" 5. " ITS MARIOLATRY	73-111

CHAPTER II.—SACRAMENTS AND WORSHIP.

	Pages
SECTION 1.—THE CONFSSIONAL—BAPTISM	111-140
" 2. " ATTRITION AND CONTRITION.....	141-146
" 3. " CONFESSION.....	146-156
" 4. " PENANCE	156-176
" 5. " ABSOLUTION.....	177-181
" 6. " INDULGENCES	181-193
" 7. " MASS.....	194-201
" 8. " EXTREME UNCTION	202-208

CHAPTER III.—EVIDENCES.

	Pages
SECTION 1.—THE CONFSSIONAL—ITS APPEAL TO THE CHURCH AND TO	
TRADITION	208-239
" 2. " TO THE FOUR MARKS.....	239-284
" 3. " TO SCRIPTURE	285-319

CHAPTER IV.—MEANS AND INSTRUMENTS.

	Pages
SECTION 1.—THE CONFSSIONAL—THE VIEW AND TREATMENT OF	
HERESY AND HERETICS.....	319-356
" 2. " ITS BEARING TOWARD THE PRESS—	
EXPURGATION, PROHIBITION AND	
DESTRUCTION OF BOOKS.....	356-386
" 3. " THE JESUITS.....	386-417

CHAPTER V.—FINAL JUDGMENT.

	Pages
THE CONFESSIONAL UNREFORMED AND UNREFORMABLE.....	417-424

APPENDIX I.

A NEW AND BASE TRAFFIC IN SACRED THINGS.

APPENDIX II.

THE INQUISITION AT THE PRESENT HOUR.

APPENDIX III.

SPECULUM R. C. SACERDOTIS EJUSQUE DISCIPULORUM.

P R E F A C E.

IN preparing this Volume for the press, I have been actuated by a stern and irresistible sense of duty. While a youth, I received, from residence in a Catholic country, impressions very unfavourable to the moral and domestic influences of Romanism. These impressions, and the recollection of their sources, have never left my mind. For many years, however, they were kept down, under a feeling which was shared by very many with whom I acted in public life—to the effect that Romanism had partaken of the general improvement of the age. The year 1848 did much to undeceive me. My mind once awakened to the real character of the papacy, I resolved to study the whole subject carefully for myself. With this view, I procured the best of the most recent expositions of Romanism, always giving preference to such as were text-books in Romanist colleges, and to such as emanated directly either from the pope himself, or very high papal authorities. I began the study in doubt—half-believing, half-denying the dark catalogue of errors, falsities and misdeeds imputed to Rome;—I terminate the study an unwilling but thorough convert. With much pain do I make the statement. It is forced from me by actual knowledge. That knowledge

compels me to bear my testimony, and, as in the presence of God, I solemnly declare that Rome morally, spiritually and politically is

THE ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION.

Of late the full spirit of Romanism has come into active operation. The political aspirations and strivings of the day, even more than the aggressions of Protestantism, have called out the very essence of the system. In consequence, Ultramontaniam has seized the reigns, and is now driving the papal chariot with a fury which can have only a fatal issue. In every civilised land the Jesuits are working, plotting and intriguing with an activity and determination which shows that they know the conflict is for life or death. Hence the uprising of the Episcopacy in France. Hence Archbishop Cullen's endeavours in Ireland. The voice that now comes forth from Catholic Europe, in defence of the pope's temporalities, issues from the central cell of Jesuitism in "the eternal city." Antonelli, the pope's prime minister, fights the battle of the papacy through Beckr, the general of the Jesuits. There is no reason to regret these manifestations. They put the real spirit of the papacy beyond a question. Political, as well as spiritual, despotism has its last stronghold in the Chair of St. Peter. Not the less are its days numbered. Romanism, considered as a form of religion, will linger on earth until destroyed by the breath of the LORD making the dead bones of our

ignorant and vicious populations live ; and this tardy decay will continue to oppose hindrances to political and social regenerations ; but the civil power of Rome hastens to its downfall, and, in that downfall, not only will myriads recover liberty and life, but a new era be inaugurated, in which religion will stand on its own ground, assert its own prerogatives, display its own power and loveliness, and so accomplish its own proper work. Already, even in Italy, the dawn shows its approach by no mistakeable signs. Remove the political incubus and the giant will arise in his native strength. The Gospel “ is not dead, but sleepeth ” merely, even under the killing *malaria* of the city of priests. Only let LOUIS NAPOLEON withdraw his bayonets, and a shout will arise as of men that hail, on shipboard, the sight of their own loved native shores. Intimations of the revival of religion are already beginning to manifest themselves in various parts of Italy, especially those over which the liberal movements of VICTOR EMANUEL are exercising a direct and marked influence, while even Naples and Rome remain not free from the sacred contagion. May the spirit of the blessed God speedily descend in rich abundance on those long and cruelly oppressed portions of His own earth.

JOHN R. BEARD.

Manchester, December 12th, 1859.

CHAPTER I. IDEAS AND AIMS.

SECTION 1.—THE CONFESSIONAL—WHAT IT IS AND WHAT IT DOES.—GENERAL SKETCH.

ROMANISM is the best organised system on the face of the whole earth. There is no other organised system fit to be compared with it. An imperial despotism, having its centre in a metropolis, and its police, magistrates, and soldiers throughout its dominions, is the nearest approach to the organised system of Romanism. But the eye and the ear of political despotism go not beyond the exterior, leaving that which properly constitutes man untouched and even unapproached. Whereas the spiritual organisation of which Rome is the centre, comprises the inner nature, and so embraces the whole of human life. The instrument which takes possession of the human heart, and turns it to the purposes of Rome is the Confessional. By means of the Confessional the thoughts, purposes, affections, and deeds of every Roman Catholic throughout the world are or may be conveyed to any desired point, or to the recognised centre of the system. You have seen a spider's web: from the centre of a circle radii pass to numerous points in the circumference, and these radii are united by

cross lines intersecting them at small intervals. Take a well drawn railway map of England; let London be the centre; then trace the iron roads to the north, to the south, to the east, to the west; reverse the process, and see how from every point of the compass the roads carry your eye back to the metropolis. A better illustration is England as it will be when strung in every part and nerved in every muscle and joint by the living and speaking wires of the electric telegraph, only you must suppose a common centre, and an everlasting ear at that centre, and a recording pen at that centre, a judgement book too, and a tribunal,—a tribunal invested with the highest functions, and the most potent sanctions. That is the system of the Confessional. It is a rude and imperfect sketch, a mere shadow of the reality, and the reality of such a nature as not to be understood except by long and minute study,—or rather by the persons who move its vast and complex machinery.

The circumference of this living organism is in one sense the inhabited earth, for Rome has its emissaries everywhere—not in catholic countries only but in non-catholic countries; not in Christian countries only but in non-Christian countries. There is no culture too high for its reach, no barbarism too low, no distance too great. Ruling, and ruling supreme so far as possible, it labours constantly to advance the boundaries of its empire wherever human foot has trod, striving and struggling, as if to it, and to it alone the divine command had been uttered, “Subdue and possess the Earth.” Of the span inclosed by this circumference different points may be considered as the centre. In a certain sense every point and every priest is a centre; with greater propriety may every Confessional be

called a centre. These, however, are but subordinate and subsidiary centres; the centre of centres is at Rome, and who there sits on the throne of the earth? The pope. Yes, outwardly the pope is the head of the church. But the Pope has a master, and the real head of the church is to be found in the college of the Propaganda. That college, too, has a head,—who is that head? The general or principal officer of the order of the Jesuits. But is he really the head? Not unless he has a stronger will than any of his subordinates. It is not every general that is a Loyola. Some of the rulers of the body have been servants to their own subordinates. The present general may have his superior. Any way the head of Romanism is not the weak man that now occupies the papal throne. It may not be the strong man that presides over the Propaganda; but as likely is it to be his secretary, or his secretary's clerk. Strange and wonderful fact that the spring which sets and keeps in movement this huge clock-work is some unseen mysterious personage who is irresponsible to every human superior.

The vast power which this statement implies, and which is centred in that invisible hand—the hand of the prime minister of the papacy—is administered and centralised by a body of men specially appointed and trained for the purpose. These may be variously described as the police, the militia, or the standing army of Rome. I refer to the Jesuits, or the members of the society of Jesus, whose founder is Ignatius Loyola. Called into existence by the emergencies into which the papacy was brought by Luther, the order of the Jesuits has for its mission to withstand and overthrow Protestantism, and to promote and establish Romanism in every land, in every house, in every heart.

With this work in its hands it has become a sort of *imperium in imperio*. Taking a general supervision, and exercising a general control over Romanism in all its workings, it is more papal than the Pope himself, and surpassing him in power, is the true ruler of the church of which he is the nominal chief. From time to time a Pope of stronger mind and more determined will asserts his authority, and in a measure gains ascendancy. But in general the Jesuits are too potent for their master, and justify the fears and hesitations which accompanied the recognition of them by Pope Paul III. They are indeed to the Pope what the Praetorian bands were to his imperial predecessors, the Cæsars—most efficient servants as long and as far as they can be made to serve, but too apt and too able to usurp the power by which they are appointed, and to which they promise allegiance.

There was a time within my own recollection when it was thought a sign of mental strength to laugh at the fears expressed by many of the workings of Jesuitism. The time is past. Not that I fear the ultimate influence of any form of spiritual despotism. I have the fullest assurance that “truth is mighty and will prevail.” But not without a struggle, and that struggle may involve many a blow and much damage. For certainly if there ever was reason to fear any combination of human force, there is reason to fear Jesuitism. Jesuitism is a universal presence even in Protestant lands, and wherever it exists, it operates by every means for one sole end, namely, the subjugation of the human mind to the tyranny of which its associates are the agents and promoters. The great avenue of Jesuitism to the human heart is the Confessional.

The Confessional may be considered outwardly and

inwardly. The Confessional considered outwardly conduces to a right and full perception of its inward aims and uses. The Confessional is the papal centry box. Placed wherever it can find standing room, it keeps watch and ward on behalf of the Pope. "Who goes there" is its constant cry. Having brought the wayfarer to a stand, it requires of him the pass word, and only after the strictest scrutiny does it allow him to go forward on his business. Enter with me a Catholic Church, *there* is a Confessional, that cabinet of wood standing near the altar. Another stands there in that side Chapel. The Cabinet consists of two parts. These parts are divided by a wainscot, in which is an apperture fitted with wire work. The wire work is covered with a thin curtain. Another and a long curtain hangs before the entrance into the cabinet. If you draw the curtain you will see two separate apartments with a seat in the one and a kneeling-stool in the other. The kneeling-stool is so placed as to allow the tenant of the apartment to bring his lips to that lattice. In the other apartment it is so arranged that the lattice can be easily reached by the ear of the tenant. Over the entrance of the cabinet is painted a name, the name of a reverend person. Every Confessional bears a separate name. So many Confessionals, so many names, and so many names, so many confessors. This is the cabinet or box, the Confessional, whence is taken the name, "the Confessional," by which is designated the practice of confession, as observed in the Roman or Western Church.

In the Confessional, viewed as a material instrument, three things ask attention. First, its structure; second, its position; and third, its use. The Confessional is so made as to receive two and only two persons, and to separate the one from the other, while a communication

between the two remains possible and even easy. That communication, however, is restricted to one of the senses, namely, the ear. The mouth of the kneeling tenant communicates with the ear of the sitting tenant. The communication is made through the aperture covered with net work,—all other communication is precluded,—the structure precludes all other communication. What is the cabinet or confessional itself for? To insulate two persons. What is the dividing wainscot for? To keep one of the two apart from the other. What is the opening in the division for? To allow the two to communicate. What is the grating for? To let the sound of the voice pass from the one to the other. What is the curtain for? To keep the eye of the one from the countenance of the other.

Strange and mysterious arrangements these to form part of a system of worship, and to be at the very centre of a religion! Strange and mysterious truly, yet necessary. These arrangements are not arbitrary nor accidental, but pre-ordained and required by authority as requisite and indispensable. The arrangements have indeed all sprung from abuses, and as preventive of those abuses they are enjoined and observed. So suspicious, however, is their look as to excite the question whether the remedy may not be as bad as the disorder, and whether in consequence the whole had not better be abolished. If two persons cannot come together without such precautions the dangers must be serious, and ought not to be incurred. For myself I like not that secrecy, I like not those precautions, and I like them the less when I know that one of those compartments may be occupied by an unmarried male, and the other by a married or unmarried female. The moment that fact is known to me I discern the origin and necessity

of that wainscot, that wirework, that curtain; and I protest against the Confessional as Italian in spirit, and immoral in tendency. These suspicions and dislikes are augmented by the position occupied by the Confessional historically considered. In the earlier ages confessions were heard by priests in their houses, and specially in the vestry. Immoralities which ensued induced the church to ordain that confession should not, except in extraordinary cases, be heard in private, and that Confessionals should be set in the open places of the Church, where they would in a manner be exposed to the public eye, and so remain under the guardianship of the public morals. Two things are specially aimed at in the position and structure of the Confessional—privacy and publicity. Privacy is sought by the seclusion of a cabinet or box, into which the persons concerned retire, and where separated from their fellow-mortals, they are also in a measure separated the one from the other; yet, inasmuch as the separation is only partial, and harm has come of the incompleteness of the insulation, publicity is sought by placing the Confessional before the eyes of those who frequent the church. This publicity, however, is not considerable, for sometimes the Confessional is found in the retirement of a side chapel, and it is in the power of the priest to hear confessions at any hour of the day, no less when the church is ordinarily deserted than when it is frequented.

The use of the Confessional is found in the making and the hearing of confession. It is auricular confession that is meant—the confession of sin to the ear of the priest with a view to obtain absolution or pardon from his lips. It is sacramental confession—the confession which is a part of the sacrament of penance, one of the seven sacraments of

the Roman church the observance of which is necessary to salvation. The Confessional is so to say the room or rooms wherein the layman or the laywoman pours his or her sins into the listening ear of the priest, and is subjected to such questions as the priest may judge desirable or necessary. Hence it will be manifest that in the degree in which the sinner is communicative, and the more he enters into the dark recesses of his heart, and in the degree in which the priest is faithful, and the more he scrutinises the foul and hidden things of that heart, is the danger of moral contamination to both, for there are thoughts and deeds which it is defilement to think of, and a fearful peril to mention.

The occupants of the confessional require a few words of specific explanation: the occupants are two. In the established phraseology of the Church, one of them is called the confessor, the other the penitent; the confessor sits in one of those compartments, the penitent kneels in the other,—the kneeling position is not universally observed, but always has the penitent been required to humble himself outwardly as well as inwardly. The holy father Joachim having in the twelfth century been sent for to her palace by the Empress Constantia to hear her confession, found that princess seated on a throne in the imperial chapel. She commanded the confessor to take a seat at her side; the confessor obeyed; but as soon as the Empress began to confess her sins, Joachim said to her, “I here hold the place of Jesus Christ, and you that of Mary Magdalene; come down from that throne, and seat yourself on the ground, or I will not listen to you.” The princess obeyed, sat down on the ground, and made her confession.

The confessor is a priest; but he is something more.

Belonging to the sacerdotal order the confessor sits as such in virtue of a specific appointment. Only those who are specially appointed to the office can exercise its functions. Confession to a non-canonically ordained officer is no confession. Instances are on record of confessions made in extremities to laymen; but the Church has decided that such confessions are irregular, and have no proper sacramental effect, though they may not be useless as means and channels of human sympathy and relief.

It is the duty of the confessor to hear the confessions of all who come to him, and to do his utmost to promote the observance. Not only is he to hear what is said to him, and to advise thereon with due imposition of punishment, and, when proper, the absolution of the penitent, he is also to question the penitent minutely and thoroughly, and by suggestions, interrogations, and the closest scrutiny, to draw on, lead, and compel the penitent to make a full and particular confession of all his sins, whether in thought, word, or deed, together with all the attendant circumstances which any way affect the character of the transgression.

The position held by the confessor in regard to the penitent is implied in what has gone before, but the point is important enough to merit illustration. While seated in the confessional the priest represents Almighty God. As representing Almighty God he possesses and exercises supreme power,—his word accordingly is God's word,—what he says is divine truth,—what he enjoins has the highest claim to respect. "We are," said Saint Francis de Sales, "judges acting under God's authority." Addressing the penitent he used to say "Am I not your father? will you not tell me all? God expects that you will open your heart; with you I hold the place of God, and yet you are ashamed to lay your sin before me."

While discharging this duty the confessor is believed to hold the keys of heaven and hell. Wielding power so tremendous he is able to extort from the soul its deepest secrets ; whatever he learns he is bound to keep undivulged. By the act of confession his lips are sealed. For spiritual purposes only he has become the depository of those designs or those deeds, and under no circumstances is he at liberty to make them known. He may have heard that you intend to take away my life ; he has his information from yourself, but he can make no use of it to put me on my guard ; at least he cannot accuse or bear witness against you openly, though catholic morality allows him to excite suspicion indirectly. But the matter is delicate, and thereupon I shall give the language of the highest authorities. “ As the confessor is the image and representative of God when he receives confessions and pronounces absolution, so must he bear God’s resemblance when he keeps the knowledge of the sin to himself. As no man knows what is said to God in the stillness of the heart and in the confidence of prayer, so must no man know what we entrust to the priest, acting in God’s stead. We have said it not to a man but to God ; the man knows nothing thereof, and all human hopes and fears will extract nothing from the priest ; his secret goes down into the grave with him, and is buried in God’s interminable compassion. In no case, though thereby he should save himself from the most frightful tortures, or ward off from another the greatest peril, must he make known the slightest failing disclosed to him in confession, unless he receives direct permission from the penitent.” A decretal put forth by pope Alexander III adds “ If a priest knows for certain that a person has been guilty of a crime, and that justice cannot take its

course without his aid, he must not accuse the offender, but indeterminately as Christ said ‘*One of you will betray me.*’ But if he who has received an injury seeks justice, the confessor may communicate the author of the injury, though the priest has become aware of the fact in confession. Not, however, by name must he remove the offender from the communion of the church, because he knows it not as judge, but as God.” The obligation of secrecy is carried so far by the great Catholic Doctor Saint Thomas Aquinas, that the confessor if under constraint may deny the truth, and confirm his denial with an oath, whether the confession may or may not have been followed by absolution, and though on the denial may depend the assassination of a king, or the ruin of a commonwealth.*

The obligation of silence contracted by the priests in hearing a criminating confession is, catholic writers declare, religiously observed, and that “even by the most corrupt in life, namely those who have fallen away from the faith.” Hence the authorities infer the divinity of the practise. A more marked and decisive proof is alleged by them in the following anecdote:—“Through the failing of a priest the knowledge of a crime, the punishment of which was death by fire, came to the ears of the civil authorities. God, however, did not permit that he who had obeyed him in making his confession should suffer the punishment. The fire denied its own nature, and spared the woman.”†

The character of the confessor in no way affects the merits of confession, or the validity of absolution. The priest may be as wicked as Judas, without affecting the efficacy of the sacrament. The sacrament is a divine grace,

* Migne, *Encyclopedie Theol.* p. 757.

† Klee, *Die Beichte* p. p. 311, 312.

communicated through a human channel. As a divine grace it is independent of the human channel through which it passes ; the channel is merely a channel, and has no influence whatever on the grace which it transmits. If a priest enjoins me to commit a murder, and I confess my sin to him, he has the power to absolve me from the penalty of my crime.

The confessor having heard the confession is authorised to declare the penitent free from guilt and punishment, imposing, however, such remedial observances as he may judge requisite or proper.

These statements and explanations in regard to the confessor make it unnecessary that I should speak at length respecting the penitent, for his duty and position are either declared or implied in what has preceded, yet a few particulars in addition seem desirable. Every son and daughter of the Church is bound to confess ; no exceptions whatever are admitted. The humblest layman and the most dignified ecclesiastic are under the same obligation. The parish priest must confess, so must the cardinal, nor is the Pope himself exempt.

To the undrilled mind of a Protestant it may seem almost incredible that the Pope should be required to confess. Is not the Pope infallible ? and if infallible surely impeccable ? Here, however, Rome aids herself by recourse to that subtlety of distinction for which she is so famous, and by which one is able to affirm and deny the same thing. The Pope, while Pope is yet a man. As Pope, the Pope is infallible and impeccable ; as man, he is fallible and peeceable. Papal authorities inform us that Giovanni di Dio, a celebrated canonist of Bologna, who lived under Innocent IV. (1243-1254), first established the doctrine that the Pope is

not sinless, and that his misdeeds are the more grave inasmuch as he is superior in dignity. During the time he makes his confession, the Pope, according to the same authority, is inferior to his confessor, though the latter may be only a simple priest, for while hearing confession the latter holds the place of God.*

Yet Rome never forgets to indulge the great, especially if they are of the sacerdotal order; thus while requiring all to confess it exempts dignitaries from scrutiny, declaring "It is not necessary to examine those who often confess and seldom sin grievously, and who are known to be aware of what is necessary for a good confession; whence as a rule priests, monks, and doctors learned in theology are not to be examined unless they seem to omit something requiring explanation."

Confession is of two kinds—particular and general. Particular confession discloses the actual state of the soul, general confession takes in the past as well as the present, supplies real or possible omissions, and is intended to make a clean breast of it once for all. Whether by particular or general confession the penitent is required to make known to the priest each and all his misdeeds in affection, motive, design, act, to regard as misdeeds those which his confessor considers and pronounces such, and to observe the discipline and to perform the penance the confessor imposes. The penitent is at liberty to select his confessor, whom as such he recognises as the keeper of his conscience and the director of his life. The whole is incumbent on every Catholic as a sequence to baptism, and a preliminary to the communion. The performance of the duty secures pardon and life, its omission entails condemnation and death. The

* *Encyclopedie Theologique*, publiée par Migne, Paris, 1844, p. 758.

confessional washes away guilt, absolves from punishment, heals the wounded soul, inspires it with strength, adorns it with graces,* and secures life eternal. To neglect the confessional is to incur the condemnation of the church, the loss of all church privileges, and the penalty of endless and unmitigated woe.

Confession should be made at least three times a year,—at the great religious festivals of Easter, Whitsuntide and Christmas. To repair to the Confessional less frequent than once a year is a serious sin of omission. Frequent confessings are very desirable, as being no less salutary than needful. In the turning-points and emergencies of life, such as marriage, journeying, sickness, and especially death, confession is a duty. Those who took part in the Crusades prepared themselves for what they held to be a sacred enterprise by confession. The same preparation is undergone by pilgrims to the Holy Land. Candidates for a conventual life are not consecrated until they have confessed. In the middle ages confession preceded the honour of knighthood. By confession sick persons aid the resources of medicine: indeed, if we believe all that church history tells us, miracle, prompted by confession, accomplishes at a word, what the physician often fails to effect with prolonged scientific treatment.

During the administration of this sacrament nothing is seen but sin on the one side and the power which destroys sin on the other. Every earthly quality and relation is lost from sight,—The great became little and the little great. Kings lay down their crowns, warriors disarm themselves, the priest is supreme, the penitent stands at his tribunal bound, guilty, condemned—only in hope of pardon and ac-

* Abluit, absolvit, sanat, corroborat, ornat.

quittal. The penitent may be an emperor, the priest may be a beggar's son, their relations are wholly changed. The one is on the throne, the other is at the footstool. King Pepin never approached his father confessor until he had put off his shoes.

The following are the directions for the use of the penitents in confession put forth on authority for use by English Catholics.

“Kneeling down at the side of your ghostly father, make the sign of the Cross, saying ‘In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, Amen.’ Then ask his blessing in these words: ‘Pray father give me your blessing for I have sinned.’ Then say the first part of the *Confiteor* as follows:

“‘I Confess to Almighty God, to the blessed Virgin Mary, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John Baptist, to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to all the Saints, and to you, Father, that I have sinned exceedingly, in thought, word and deed, through my fault, through my fault, through my most grievous fault.’

“After this accuse yourself of your sins, adding after each sin the number of times that you have been guilty of it, and such circumstances as may very considerably aggravate the guilt.

“After you have confessed all that you can remember, conclude with this or the like form:

‘For this and all my other sins which I cannot at this present call to my remembrance I am heartily sorry, purpose amendment for the future, and most humbly ask pardon of God and penance and absolution of you, my ghostly father: Therefore I beseech the blessed Mary ever Virgin, blessed Michael the archangel, blessed John Baptist, the holy

Apostles Peter and Paul, all the Saints, and you, father, to pray to our Lord God for me.'

Then give attentive ear to the instructions and advice of your confessor, and humbly accept of the penance enjoined by him. Whilst the priest gives you absolution bow down your head, and with great humility call upon God for mercy, and beg of him that he would be pleased to pronounce the sentence of absolution in heaven, whilst his minister absolves you upon earth. Be careful to perform your penance in due time, and in a penitential spirit."

The result of confession and absolution is the removal of sin. The removal is held to be positive and complete. The words of the confessor "I absolve thee," are a true and proper absolution. Thereby the sin is pardoned. The catholic church expressly declares that the words of the priest are not deprecatory but authoritative—that they do not entreat God to pardon, but convey pardon. Accordingly the Council of Trent decreed "If any one says that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a judicial act, let him be accursed."

Such in outline is the Confessional. The ideas and practices which it represents are so strange to Protestants and Englishmen that I have thought it my duty to make statements, some of which may be judged unnecessary. I have run the risk the less unwillingly because many intelligent and fair-judging persons doubt representations on the subject made by popular and noisy opponents of Romanism.

The view now presented shows the Confessional in its least objectionable form. It has another side, and that other side must not be passed in silence. Before I speak of it I will make a reflection or two such as what has gone before immediately suggests. The Romanist alleges scrip-

tural authority on behalf of the Confessional. The allegation shall in due time be examined. Meanwhile does not the scripture teach that no one but God, and the Son of God can forgive sin.* The reason is that no one but God can detect and measure guilt, can allot and apportion punishment, can trace the workings and the effect of the penal discipline, can ascertain its result. The state of the heart is known to neither penitent nor confessor. The penitent, more or less ignorant of his condition, is unable to reveal his guilt exactly and fully. Equally is the confessor unable to learn whether the penitent has or has not made a true and full confession. Sincerity of contrition escapes every eye but the All-seeing One. Yet sincerity, Romanists declare indispensable to pardon. As well suppose that a physician could cure a disorder, the exact nature and extent of which he did not know, as that a human being, a sinful human being, one who has himself need to confess, and who in his turn must become a penitent, can heal a heart with which he is but partially acquainted, and of whose chief sores he may be totally ignorant. The Romish priest denies the implication and boldly declares "*I do forgive sin.*" In his turn he is contradicted by fact. Society is full, and his own literature is full of contradictions supplied by facts. Sins pronounced by him forgiven are not forgiven, for they remain in their guilt, their baseness, their woe. In fancy only are they forgiven, not in reality. Confessors themselves have gone the length of declaring the greater number of confessions either invalid, or sacrilegious.† But whatever the Confessional may do or leave

* Mark II, 7; Luke V, 21; Isaiah XLIII, 25.

† Manuel des Confesseurs, par l'Abbe J. Gaume;" 7th edit. 1854 p. 108, seq.

undone, it tends to efface the vividness of the sense of guilt, and add hypocrisy to licentiousness. Instead of making sin appear "exceedingly sinful," it makes it appear coarse, vulgar, and common place. Flowers that are passed from hand to hand lose their form and beauty, so sin parts with its sinfulness when dealt with after the rough handlings of the Confessional. If the object were to blot out the instinctive impressions of man's moral nature, a more effectual method could not be taken.

Another objection which comes out of the details into which we have entered is the tremendous power which the Confessional puts into the hands of the Romish priest. That power is absolute—whether for this world or the next that power is absolute. Sitting as a God in judgment, the confessor rules two worlds—time and eternity. On his word depends your present lot, and equally on his word depends your future destiny. Your character he does much to form, for he forms your circumstances. Your fate he holds in his own hands, and making your path here dark or bright, he makes your future tempestuous or calm through ages which have neither number nor termination.

Absolute power is absolute despotism, except in the hands of absolute wisdom and holiness. None but God can wield God's sceptre beneficially. It is idle to reply that God is the source of this sacerdotal authority. Not the source only but the channels must be clean if the water we drink is to be pure and salubrious. As it is the channels that lie nearest to us, so is it from the channels we take the water we drink. If they are impure our beverage is impure. A filthy stream supplies filthy water. So the man makes the system, and the priest determines the character of the religion he administers. Are the wisdom and the

holiness of the catholic priest absolute? The Confessional inflates the priest as much as it degrades the penitent. Man is not made for power such as the Confessional bestows. How baneful the Confessional is to the confessor will be shown hereafter. At present it suffices to observe that the Confessional makes the confessor a tyrant even as it makes the penitent a slave. And never has the relation of tyrant and slave existed, even in a mitigated form, without entailing on both tyrant and slave sore evils and distressing woes.

The more painful part of our duty remains; the dark side of the Confessional must receive some notice. This dark side is a mass of immorality of which only the surface can be touched. The Confessional pollutes both the confessor and the penitent; it pollutes both, for it deals with the grossest and most putrid defilements. With these it deals avowedly and professedly,—with these it is its duty to deal,—the confessor is instructed and trained in order to deal with these,—the penitent is compelled to submit to be dealt with in regard to these. There is no act, however foul, but the confessor is made familiar with it in his preparatory education. These sinks of humanity are, too, the places into which every penitent is liable to be plunged. Manuals written expressly to fit the confessor for the duties of his office contain details the most disgusting, the most loathsome, the most polluting,—ruinous alike to confessor and penitent. Such manuals are in my possession. If the truth of my description is questioned, I challenge the Romish priests to the proof. The test is fair and easy,—I will supply the passages if any confessor will read them before the public.

I had begun to transcribe questions required to be put by

the confessor in examining his penitent on the sixth commandment, but I could not proceed. These questions circulate in catholic families freely and in open English, for they are found in one of the most common of their religious manuals. In consequence they come into the hands of youths, maidens, and children. Yet I am restrained from transcribing these partly from a sense of respect to myself, and partly from a sense of duty relative to the public, for transcribe these I could not without at least the risk of spreading a knowledge of sins and crimes which can exist in only degraded or beastly natures. Yet these questions are only general. All the details really or possibly connected with these questions are supplied in other manuals, and with both generals and particulars the confessor is required to be familiar, and to a minute scrutiny in both generals and particulars every catholic of both sexes, and of all ages, is liable each time he or she enters the confessional. Such is the system some are trying to force on England! Some notion may, however, be formed of the questions to which I have referred if I transcribe a few others which the confessor is taught to put, in manuals published by authority for his guidance. I shall translate the passages word for word.

“ If a priest comes to confession, ask him if he has said his masses, if he says mass hurriedly, if he celebrates mass in less than a quarter of an hour, if he engages in business, if he is given to gambling. If the priest is a confessor ask him in particular whether he has studied sufficiently, and whether he continues to study. If unhappily this confessor has solicited any one to base deeds, ask him if he knows that thereby he is disqualified. If the penitent is a nun, ask her in particular if she recites the Divine Office, if she cherishes any dangerous affection, if she has received

love letters or verbal communications. Should one be a doorkeeper, ask her if she leaves the door open with danger of scandal. Should she be a messenger, ask her if she brings letters or suspected commissions. If it is a physician ask him if he has sufficient knowledge and experience, if he has given a patient leave to eat animal food without necessity, especially if he takes care that the sick confess ere it is too late. If it is an apothecary, ask him if he has given drugs to women with child to procure abortion, if he has either sold a drug too dear, or sold one drug for another. If a tradesman comes to you, ask him if he has cheated in weight or measure, and if he has sold his goods at too high a price. If your penitent is a tailor, ask him if he works on holy-days, if he keeps the fasts enjoined by the church, if he takes cabbage. Should he be a barber, ask him if he shaves on Sunday in places where it is not customary.* These questions would, it is fair to presume, not be put were there not corresponding moral conditions. They, therefore, paint the actual morality of the classes to whom they pertain. If the colours are dark, the reason may be found in the state of moral dependence and weakness which the putting of such questions occasions and perpetuates. The Confessional breaks the very back of manly virtue. Crushing is the power of the Romish priesthood.

These questions excite astonishment—astonishment that physicians, tradesmen, and others submit to be questioned in so insulting a manner.

These questions excite pity—pity that one's fellow beings should be and remain in a condition so unworthy, so unseemly, so dishonouring.

* "Manual des Confesseurs," p. 190-198.

Is this a condition into which English protestants will allow themselves to be led?

SECTION II.

THE CONFESSIONAL—ITS THEOLOGY.

The confessional deals with sin. In dealing with sin it deals with theology. The practical character of the Confessional causes it to take up a theology ready made to its hands, even as the nature of sin with which it deals compels it to go to the centre of that theology, and embrace in its teachings the notions which in its system are fundamental. Thus the Confessional is a teaching as well as a disciplinary institution. What does it teach? What set of theological opinions does it inculcate and enforce? Ignorant here we can have but a very imperfect conception of the influence the Confessional exercises over human minds. We are then invited to study the theology of the confessional. For this purpose I open the pages of a learned work expressly written by a Jesuit father for the exposition of papal orthodoxy, and translate from the latin original,* condensing the statements as much as is allowed by regard to intelligibility.

“ Our first parents transgressed a command given them by God, and by that transgression committed a grave sin. Hence ensued the wrath of God, the loss of original righteousness, death in the soul, and captivity to the devil.

Praelectiones Theologicae quas in collegio Romano Societatis Jesu habebat. J. PERBONE, in eodem Coll. Theolog. Profess. Parisiis, 1842.

The evil has been transfused into every son and daughter of Adam. By the evil termed "original sin," man's moral liberty is diminished but not destroyed. When with that liberty a man violates God's law he commits actual sin. Actual sin is of two kinds, venial and mortal; the former is the less guilty, consisting rather in omissions and infirmities, the latter is deadly, because in it man voluntarily renounces the Creator for the creature."

"The Son of God regarded our lost condition in his sufferings and death, and when we were enemies to God, on account of the great love wherewith he loved us, obtained by his merits our justification, so as to redeem and blot out the sins of all ages, and to satisfy his Father for them abundantly and superabundantly. By this satisfaction he paid to God whatever was owing by us, and so made God placable and propitious to us, having by his death on the cross discharged our debt and most fully satisfied God. The merits of Christ are applied to men by God's grace, through the influence of the Holy Ghost, so that justification is not only the remission of sins, but the sanctification and renovation of the inner man by his voluntary acceptance of God's grace and gifts, whence he who was unjust becomes just, he who was an enemy becomes a friend, so that he is an heir of God according to the hope of eternal life. In this process is included faith which believes those things to be true which God has revealed and promised, especially that the unjust is justified by God's grace. Those who are thus justified go on from virtue to virtue, being renewed every day by mortifying their fleshly members, and by observing the commands of God and the Church, increasing in good works with the inspiration of faith; for not by faith alone is man justified, and out of the church there is no salvation."

Such is the system of which confession is the central instrument. The system has two faces—sin the source of evil, Christ the source of good. From the former comes the disease, the latter supplies the remedy. Sin is at once a taint of nature, guilt and transgression. The taint was contracted by Adam in whose misdeed all his descendants shared. The taint infused moral poison into the veins of the human race. In due time Christ, the great physician, furnished a remedy. His death placated God who was angry at human guilt, and redeemed man from the hands of Satan. The stream of new life which he pours into human kind passes through one and but one channel. That channel is the Roman Catholic church. The church has full power to bestow or withhold the good purchased by Christ. That good is two-fold, negative and positive. It is negative in so far as it removes sin and its penalties. It is positive in so far as it bestows sanctity and happiness. The sacraments are the instruments of the church. By these she works her beneficent work. Of these penance is one, and of penance confession is the essence. The exact mode in which confession acts may be described thus.

Sin brings on man

Guilt, God's anger, eternal punishment—temporal penalties

Which are removed in virtue of confession
involving

the infinite sacrifice of Christ,

the assisting grace of God,

the absolution of the Priest,

the indulgencies of the church as actual facts (and)

On the part of man

Contrition, } Compensations or satisfactions to God,—such
Confession. } as alms, prayers, penances.

The idea involved as well in the thought as in the language is that of a debt,—man is the debtor, God the creditor. Man contracts a debt,—God requires payment. The debt is not paid,—God is angry. Christ intervenes, and pays the debt,—God is satisfied and man is—

What? Free? By no means; the debt is paid but the note of hand is not returned, nor are the prison doors thrown open. After all man may remain a permanent prisoner. The key is in the hands of the priest. Having by your representative satisfied God, you must now in yourself satisfy the priest, or—perish everlastingly. These are hard lines. But this is not all,—

That debt—did you contract it yourself? The foundation of the embarrassment which has made you a bankrupt was laid by Adam many thousand years ago; not you then, but he is answerable for the debt. It is true you have had your share in the transactions, but the concern was insolvent when you entered it; and your entrance was not voluntary on your part, but forced on the part of your creditor. The creditor knowing how rickety the establishment was, knowing that you had no money yourself, put you into it with his own hand, and made you answerable not merely for your own acts but for the acts, first of all your predecessors, and secondly, for that one false step taken by the House which entailed inevitable ruin on himself and all his successors.

You have not contracted the debt, but being held liable to it you paid it. You paid it as a human being by the hands of your proxy when Christ died for all men. Is it alleged that your acquittance depends on yourself?—Then the payment was partial and conditional, not entire and absolute. Yet the church declares that Christ paid

the whole debt and fully satisfied the creditor. Either Christ paid the debt or he did not pay the debt ; if he paid the debt then you, one of the debtors, are free ; if he did not pay the debt how can it be honestly declared that he did pay the debt ?

Not only as a human being but as a Christian you have paid the debt by your representative ; you have complied with the condition, for you believe, and you believe what the church teaches. "But to believe does not suffice, you must confess." "I have confessed ; surely I am entitled to a receipt in full." "No ; there are 'temporal penalties,'—these you must either endure or compound for." "Then it is not true that Christ paid the debt and satisfied my creditor." "You must not reason." "Reason ? it is a matter of fact that is at issue ; did Christ pay my debt ? if so it is a gross injustice to require payment a second time." "A matter of fact it is, and you must obey the church or perish everlastingly." Reduced to this alternative you meet the claim by compensations and satisfactions, and now fancy you must be free. By no means—you are still in the hands of the jailer. You ask for his bill of charges, and desirous of your liberty you comply with his demands. Surely you may at length go at large. Instead of going at large you find yourself in Purgatory. Helpless yourself, you are wholly dependent on the charity of your friends. With more or less effort they raise a fund, the object of which is to get you out of prison ; the only effect is an alleviation of your condition : more money is raised, a larger fee is given to your jailer, and at length you are set at liberty. But suppose you have no friends, or suppose the friends you have are penniless—then everlasting incarceration is your destiny,—you must rot in jail : and yet the

obligation which has involved you in all this trouble and ended in your ruin was in effect contracted by another. The time was when debtors were cruelly treated both in ancient Rome and modern England, but no cruelty inflicted by human creditors is comparable with the cruelty ascribed to God by the sacerdotal speculation of the Roman church. There are no parallels in human society by which the enormity of this theological injustice can be represented. Here is a camel driver; he has overloaded his beast: the animal sinks on the sand with a broken back. Enraged, its owner increases the burden, and tortures the animal to make it rise. It rises only to fall. Finding the case hopeless, the driver puts a pistol to its head, and transfers his merchandise to another. This is cruel, but the cruelty has in it a touch of mercy. Where is the mercy on the part of the priest? He requires perfection of an imperfect being, and punishes him through all eternity for not being what he could not be. He exacts from a pauper payment to the last farthing of a debt which has been already paid, though he knows that payment in full is impossible, and when he has received from the debtor's friends all they can scrape together, still remains inexorable, and failing of the camel-driver's mercy, puts no pistol to the head of the wretched sufferer, but consigns him to darkness, chains, and torments "world without end." Such is sacerdotal justice! Insult is added to injury, for the creditor is declared to be merciful and gracious. The priest may reply that he is not amenable to the bar of reason. The answer is that of his own free will he has entered an appearance in that court, has even put in his pleas and must now abide the issue. What else is it when the priest undertakes to prove his doctrine, to remove objections, and to confute the

doctrine of his opponents? To prove and disprove—what is it but to appeal to the bar of reason? Without reason, can you prove or disprove any thing? and if you appeal to my reason in proof of your opinions, you have no right to complain if I employ my reason for their disproof. Rome makes a great mistake when she calls in the aid of reason, for reason can never render aid to what is unreasonable.

She has, however, another resource. “I am infallible,” she declares, “on the ground of my infallibility you are required to believe what I teach.” This ground, however, she forfeited the very moment she constructed an argument in proof of her system. Infallibility does not argue; all arguing implies uncertainty, and uncertainty and infallibility will not go together. If I am infallible I have no occasion to argue, my duty is to demand your credence of my word, for my word is infallible. If I argue I leave the high tower of my infallibility, and descend to the level of reason, that is of probability, on which you stand. That which is infallible is certain, that which is argued is at the best but probable. Probable is merely provable, and so provable is probable; but the probable and the infallible exclude each other as much as the certain and the uncertain. One of two things then the priest must do,—he must either cease to reason or cease to claim infallibility.

We will suppose that he decides in favour of infallibility. “I am infallible,” he says, “therefore believe what I say.” It is a large claim you make,—so large that it must be carefully looked at before it is allowed. You have, it seems, decided to renounce reason and claim infallibility. It is, is it not? by an act of your own mind you have come to this decision? You have resolved to assume in-

fallibility for reasons known and satisfactory to yourself; so then you have *reasons* for the step you take; that step in consequence *is recommended by reason*. Here we are then back in our former position. Reason and infallibility are confounded in your mind. By reason you are led to abandon reason, and the uncertain conducts you to the certain! You stand on a bridge which you this moment declare to totter under your feet, and the next to be as solid and firm as the everlasting hills. Not until a clean thing can come out of an unclean can infallibility proceed from a fallible mind. It is vain to declare the light to proceed from God; God's light in entering the human mind submits to its conditions. As the infinite is infinite only in its own place, that is God, so the infallible ceases to be infallible the moment it quits the infallible Being. Fallibility and infallibility are qualities of mind; and not until God can communicate himself wholly to man,—the infinite to the finite, the boundless to the bounded,—can the Universal Mind be transferred into the contracted limits of sacerdotal infallibility.

But why disprove your claim? The labour is supererogatory. He that puts forward a claim is bound to give it the best support he can. I call on you then to maintain your claim. How can you discharge the duty? You will allege your reasons, you will array your proofs, you will construct your arguments? Back on the rotten bridge of reason we thus find ourselves once more. How idle to think of proving the more certain by the less certain! If reason is not reliable for probabilities how can it be reliable for infallibility? You renounce the authority of reason with this hand, and with the other you deduce from reason the authority of infallibility. You will prove to me your

own infallibility? Have you reflected what the task involves? Two minds are concerned in the operation,—your mind and my mind. How are they concerned? They put their reason into play. Is reason infallible? “Certainly not; reason is fallible.” If so your reason as well as mine is fallible,—can two negatives make a positive? Can two fallibles produce an infallible? If not, you have undertaken an impossibility, and had better retire from the task.

You are unwilling to retire. Unable to prove you become bold and loud in assertion; to assertion you add threats. “Believe me,” you say, “or perish, for out of the church there is no salvation.” This is mere passion; beaten in argument you have lost your temper. Frighten whom you may you will not frighten me, and so I pass on to another view of the doctrine you teach as the sole way of salvation.

It is in regard to confession that we are considering the Roman catholic theology. Whether confession is right and true or not, confession cannot be right and true unless the whole system of which it forms the practical outlet is right and true. The Hindoos support their heaven on the earth, and the earth on an elephant, and the elephant on a tortoise. On what is the Confessional supported? The fall of Adam is its basis. But the fall of Adam implicates his original righteousness; on what does that rest? On a misrepresentation—a gross and palpable misrepresentation of words whose age and whose authorship are unknown. The fall of Adam corrupted human kind because all men descended from Adam and his wife; the alleged descent I will not deny, but I know that it is denied by scholars whose learning and impartiality are beyond suspicion. If it is probable that there was but one human

pair, it is also probable that there were several, not to say many, human pairs. If the aboriginal Australian were to say "I deny my obligation as to the debt, for the line of my progenitors leads me to back to another couple than Adam and Eve," his plea in bar of liability would find scientific support of a very high order. The same may be said of the nations of Timbuctoo, and of Pernambuco. O yes, many uncertainties must be converted into certainties before you have any chance of establishing the authority of the Confessional. You tell me your church guarantees them all, and I ask you in reply who or what guarantees your church? It is very liberal in your Church to answer for that for which no one else will answer,—but what is the answer worth? The answer is on paper,—is it "a kite," or a negociable bill of exchange? One thing is certain, namely, that the paper has been refused, and is at this moment refused by some of those whose "word is as good as their bond."

I will put down several propositions, all of which must be true, or your doctrine of confession is a nothing.

1. All men are descended from Adam and Eve.
2. Adam and Eve were originally holy and happy.
3. Adam and Eve corrupted their nature by eating an apple they were forbidden to eat.
4. Adam and Eve transmitted this corrupt nature to all their descendants.
5. By this transgression Adam and Eve brought on themselves and their posterity the wrath of God, and the pains of eternal woe.
6. The evil which Adam did Christ undid, yet so as to leave man's eternal salvation a contingency.
7. The right to a share of what he did Christ empowered Peter to distribute among men.

8. That right has descended from Peter to the present Pope.

9. From the present pope, or the Church of which he has the keys, the right passes in direct lines to all the duly appointed confessors on the face of the earth.

10. These things are guaranteed by the pope and the church, who are guaranteed by tradition, which is the pope and the church under another name, that is, the pope and the church guarantee themselves.

11. The only other authority is the scripture. The scripture is of divine origin. If you ask how is that known, you are told the Church is the voucher. Deny for instance that all men are descended from Adam and Eve, you are met by the reply it is written in the book of Genesis. If you ask why you are to believe the book of Genesis, the answer is, because the Church declares it to be the word of God.

12. Hence it appears that all authority resolves itself into the authority of the Church; accordingly another proposition comes to be added to those which precede, namely, the Church is infallible.

13. But what is the Church? It is an aggregate of priests, of priests of a particular kind, consequently the proposition is the priests of the Roman catholic church are infallible. But the qualities of every aggregate is the sum of the qualities of each compound part, therefore, since the priests are infallible, each priest is infallible: otherwise a number of fallibles would make up an infallible; which is the same as to say that a number of blacks would produce a white.

14. The last proposition then is, that every priest of the Roman catholic church is infallible, if this is not so the Confessional has no basis. But infallibility cannot be

predicated of man: consequently confession is without support, and as without support, so without efficacy. A loop-hole for escape from this delima has been contrived. "It is not," it is said "the priest or the pope that is infallible but God's spirit dwelling in them." The allegation has been answered by anticipation. I will only say in addition, the fact if so, could be known only by yourself, and you are avowedly fallible; nor could the fact be made known to me except by proof, and proof involves the possibility of disproof. Now where disproof is possible infallibility is impossible: consequently you can neither know nor show that the pope or priest possesses God's infallible spirit.

The final conclusion stands thus:—

1. If every priest does not possess infallibility,—
2. If the pope or the church does not possess infallibility,—
3. If the account of the fall in the book of Genesis is not infallible,—
4. If the ordinary interpretation put on that account is not infallible,—
5. If there has been any break in the descent from Peter to Pius IX,—
6. If Christ did not give to Peter supreme authority,—
7. If Christ achieved something else than the Roman church teaches,—
8. If the evil done by Adam did not poison all human souls,—
9. If Adam did not corrupt his nature by his disobedience,—
10. If Adam began his career in moral infancy,—
11. If human life radiated originally from other points besides the garden of Eden,—

Then in each contingency

The Confessional is null and void,
for its existence and function, its right to be, depends on every one of these successive links.

But each of these successive links is improbable, very improbable, some most improbable not to say impossible. What then must be the aggregate uncertainty of the whole? A calculation of the improbabilities of the Confessional would give as its result an almost positive certainty of its invalidity.

What then supports the Confessional? Bold assumption on the side of the priest, and gross credulity on the side of the people. Is it not bold assumption for a human being to claim infallibility in any way? on any grounds?—infallibility, the exclusive attribute of the one Omniscient Mind! The existence of gross credulity on the part of the people is a fact patent to all eyes. When one, who was more of a wag than a religionist, was asked if he was willing to sign the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England, he answered "Certainly, and only wished they were forty." What that humourist said in jest, the Roman church requires her adherents to say in earnest, putting into their mouth this which she calls

"An act of Faith.

We most firmly believe there is only one true and living God; but that in this one God there are three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; that the Son took to himself the nature of man from the Virgin's womb by the operation of the Holy Ghost; and that in this our human nature he was crucified and died for us; that afterwards he rose again and ascended into heaven; whence he shall come to reward the just with everlasting glory, and to

inflict everlasting punishment on the wicked. *Moreover we believe whatever else the Catholic Church proposeth to be believed, and this because God who is the Sovereign truth which can neither err nor lead into error, hath revealed all these things to this his Church. Grant, O God, that we may humbly receive and firmly hold fast all those truths which thou hast revealed, and thy Church has proposed to our belief.'*

"Moreover we believe whatever else the catholic church proposeth to be believed."

there is the additional article, the fortieth, of the Roman church. It is a very wide one, who can tell what it may contain? Not so long since an addition was made to it in the acknowledgment of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, which the pope declared to be an article of the Christian faith, without the belief of which no one can be saved.

SECTION III.

THE CONFESSIONAL—ITS IDEALS.

A few years ago we were present at services connected with the opening of a Romanist cathedral in a northern district of England. A sermon was preached on the occasion; the object of which was to persuade the hearers to place implicit confidence in the priest. Among other reasons assigned why the auditors should reason no longer but submit to sacerdotal guidance, there was one which, had

we not heard it with our own ears, we should scarcely have believed it possible for any one to advance in the present day. The reason was that the priest had power to do anything he pleased. This proposition propounded no less broadly than gravely the preacher undertook to prove. His argument, in brief, ran as follows:—The priest surpassed in power all the great ones whose deeds are recorded in the Bible! Moses divided the Red Sea, and led the children of Israel through in safety, while he overwhelmed the Egyptians beneath its closing walls of flood,—but the priest could do more than Moses! Joshua conducted the children of Israel across the Jordan at the season when the river is deepest, broadest, and most rapid—but the priest could do more than Joshua. The same Joshua made the sun stand still, and with the sun all the planetary orbs—but the priest could do more than Joshua. Daniel resisted the fire and tamed hungry lions—but the priest could do more than Daniel. Jesus Christ raised Lazarus from the dead—but the priest could do more than Jesus Christ. “This you all see and know,” said the speaker, directly addressing the congregation, “every time you attend mass, for before your eyes the priest commands Almighty God to come down from heaven, and on that altar to be made into bread. This is the act of your priests. The act surpasses all other acts, and he by whom it is performed is able, and no less willing than able, to do for you whatever you may need.”

Given the premises the argument is irresistable, and though the whole is painfully and distressingly irreverent to Protestants, it was to all appearance equally impressive and convincing with those to whom it was addressed. The reason is that the priest is a species of divinity in Roman-

ism. Every system, as every individual man and woman, has its ideals. The ideal of Protestantism is mental freedom. The ideal of Popery is sacerdotalism. Individual culture and individual perfection Protestants make their great aim, while sacerdotal excellence is all but worshipped by Catholics. The ideals of a system, whatever that system is, determine its character and write its history. Accordingly we cannot know the Confessional unless we know what are its ideals. We must therefore study its ideals. When we know what is its ideal perfection we shall be acquainted with its aims, and may predict its operations and achievements.

The Confessional has two ideals. The two principal ideals of the Confessional are, 1st the priest, 2nd the Virgin. To generalise the statement a priest and a virgin are Rome's ideals. Now a priest is a man exercising sacerdotal functions, and a virgin is a woman not yet married. Hence it might be supposed that a man as man, and a woman as woman, stood high in the scale of confessional estimates. It is not so. We must therefore take the two elements separately, if we would fully understand the intense sanctifying efficacy of self-mortification as recognised and enforced in the religion of the Confessional. We take first the male ideal, and secondly the female.

The male ideal of the Confessional has no value as a male except that males only can be priests. Beyond this negative qualification the male element is worthless, or rather corrupt, and a source of corruption; as such it is to be warred against, if not to be exterminated. Man, as man, is a beast that needs to have its fangs extracted, and its talons cut away, if not to be bound and kept in chains of iron; man, as man, is all but powerless for good, though

powerful enough for evil. In matters of religion he is little better than a stock or a stone; certain is he to go astray, and so to perish if he consults his reason or even the Bible apart from the priest. It is only when he is sacerdotalised that he is in a state of grace; the priest is the great magnet of the religious world: only under its influence can you live dutifully here or escape eternal burnings hereafter. The priest holds the keys of the bottomless pit as well as of paradise. Give him your hand, make him your friend, listen to his bidding, obey his law, implicitly follow his leading, and you are safe for time and eternity; if not, not. The priest in consequence is the arbiter of your destiny, and as of your destiny so of the destiny of all men. What wondrous virtues then are represented by that word priest! what mysterious qualities does it represent! The priest has, in the priest, slain the beast—the man—and acquired power to live a divine life,—a life so rich in marvellous and transcending efficacy as to be potent enough to give or deny to every human being the unutterable bliss or woe of this world and the next! Why, what is the power of princes, kings, emperors, compared with this inherent and inalienable prerogative? They may remit a sentence or spare a life, but they are unable to forgive sin, and so save a soul from death. Let them then lower their prond sceptres, and bow their haughty heads before the true King—the King of the mind, the King of the conscience, the King of the soul, the King of the inner world, and as such the King of the outer world, and so the King of the universe—the potentate that transmutes the Creator into a wafer! This inconceivable efficacy is communicated to the man when he becomes a priest, by receiving the Holy Spirit with the imposition of hands on

the part of the ordaining bishop, through whom the sacred unction is communicated to him in three divine qualities,—1st, habitual grace ; 2nd, sacramental grace ; 3rd, specific, that is, sacerdotal character. These qualities, independent of the man both naturally and morally, are permanent and indelible. One and only one requisite for their reception and retention is there, namely, celibacy. On the condition of his being and remaining a bachelor the man may be converted into the priest, and, receiving sacerdotal dedication, become like God on earth.*

The ideal priest is portrayed by Chrysostom (4th century). The painting contains a predominance of ethical excellencies which give it relief and distinguish it from the hard and unfruitful sacerdotalism of later ages, while it depicts in dark colours the vices of the clergy of the times. “The priesthood is exercised on the earth, but has its origin in heaven; and with good reason is it classed among celestial things, since not a man, nor an angel, nor an archangel, but the Holy Spirit himself has instituted it, and in the institution has given us the confidence that we exercise here below an altogether angelic ministry in a mortal body. The consequence of this principle is that he who is invested with the priesthood ought to lead on earth the same life as if he were already in heaven among the blessed spirits. When you see the God of heaven immolate and annihilate himself on the altar, the priest bending over the victim, occupied in prayer, and all those present dyed in the precious blood, can you at that moment believe that you are on earth and among men?—do you not feel raised above the heavens?—does not every carnal thought remove from your spirit?—and your soul disengaged

* Scavini Theolog. Moral. Univ., 313 seq., Vol. III.

from the senses, discovers what goes on in a higher world. What a marvel! Ineffable prodigy of the love of God toward men! He who is seated in the skies, at the right hand of his Father, he not disdaining to allow himself to be touched by the hands of all, gives himself to whosoever is willing to receive him, yields to our embraces, is disclosed to all by the eyes of faith! I ask you can a ministry consecrated to functions so noble be an object of contempt? And let it not be thought that any one in the world should consider it beneath him. If you reflect that it is a mortal enveloped in flesh and blood, who is able thus to approach that blessed and immortal nature, you will understand what is the dignity with which the grace of the Holy Spirit has honoured priests, since it is by their ministry that those wonders are wrought, and others too not less important, for the glory and salvation of men; feeble creatures cast on a miserable earth, to be called to the dispensation of the things of heaven, and to receive a power which has not been given to angels and archangels! The princes of the earth act only on the body, the priest acts on the soul, and so in heaven; the sentence pronounced by the priest here God ratifies in the abode of his glory and confirms it with his seal. He has invested his ministers with his peculiar power, and so raised them above their own nature. The priest does not call down fire from heaven, he makes the Holy Ghost descend thence to earth."

Such is one of the ideals which the Confessional has to inform the minds of its disciples with—the young, the adult, and the aged, so as to bring the whole inner life into willing and ready concurrence with sacerdotal sanctities, claims, and functions. The other ideal is virginity. As before so here we must distinguish the woman from the

virgin : the virgin, as a virgin, is but an unmarried woman, and so belongs to Satan rather than to Christ. Only when her nature is taken out of her by the holy unction of self-consecration, ministered by sacerdotal hands, does the woman become the second ideal. Maternity has indeed a virtue of its own, and is a religious state, for it is made so by the sacrament of matrimony ; but motherhood is a state inferior to sacerdotalised virginity, which is the highest condition attainable by females on earth, except the condition of saintship.

The following are the terms in which Saint Cyprian (3rd century) expresses his ideas of the unmarried state :—
 “ What is virginity except the practical meditation of the future life ? Amiable modesty, thou unitest us to the Lamb. Virgins, you change the earth into heaven ; you make men equal to angels ; you are the crown of the virtues. Charming liberty ; perpetual infancy ; sweet, amiable sense of shame, how divine thy charms ! How precious thou art, but alas, how frail ! To conquer your enemy is to conquer only a man ; to triumph over pleasure is to triumph over yourself.”*

Saint Ambrose (4th century) wrote three books on virginity, and addressed them to his sister Marcillina. Declaring marriage good, he pronounces virginity better. We cite certain parts. “ I recommend you to embrace virginity—it is an advice, not a command. Of all the Christian virtues virginity is the only one to which I can give an invitation instead of an injunction. It is a vow, a special grace ; it asks for chosen ones, not slaves. A virgin is a gift of heaven ; she is the glory and joy of her relatives ; she exercises in her home the priesthood of

* De Disciplina et Bono Pudicitiae.

chastity. A virgin is a victim who immolates herself each successive day to appease the wrath of God by her sacrifice. Every virgin is a queen, whether because a virgin consecrated to God is the spouse of the greatest of sovereigns, or because subduing her passions, which are the most disgraceful servitude, she acquires a new empire over herself. Because the virgin has received superabundant graces the Lord watches over her with special care, and surrounds her with a more powerful protection ; he appoints for her guard a legion of angels, who fight for her defence. It is not wonderful that they combat on her behalf since she serves under the same standards as the celestial spirits."

The virtue and the praises of virginity attain their apotheosis in " the Virgin Mary," the supreme ideal of feminine sacerdotalism in the Roman Church. She is described by Ambrose as follows :—" Her entire life is a mirror in which are reflected the rays of the purest virtue and the highest perfection. Can you conceive anything more noble than the mother of a God, more illustrious than her whom the Father of Lights has chosen, more chaste than her who brought forth a babe without contracting the least soil ? A virgin not in body only but in mind, of a candor which kept from her heart even the shadow of disguise and dissimulation, modest and humble, composed in speech, frugal in word, wise and guarded, constant in reading the sacred scriptures, putting trust not in uncertain riches but in the prayers of the poor, ceaseless in labour, seeking as a witness of her good deeds no one but God. Far from wounding any one she did good to all the world. Did any one ever see her take a haughty air toward her parents, oppose their wishes, regard her inferiors with disdain ? Moderate in food and sleep, orderly in the practice of her

duties, she was never less solitary than when alone."

This, doubtless, is in the main the portrait of an excellent woman though it is drawn from imagination, and contains the germ of the dogma of "the immaculate conception."

While however virginity is thus extolled, womanhood, as we have intimated, is accounted of small value. The low condition of woman apart from ecclesiastical consecration arises not from the vice of original sin which she shares with man, but a peculiar infirmity and perverseness of nature incident to her as a female. Hence views of feminine nature are current in Romanist literature which are dark and painful. These, however, present the real estimates of woman sanctioned and prevalent among Romanists, and contrast absurdly enough with the affected politenesses of social intercourse manifested in France, Italy, and other catholic countries. This point is of no small importance in its bearing on the moral and religious influence of the Confessional, we shall therefore give some illustrative quotations.

In a council held at Aix la Chapelle, in 816, it was declared in the presence of Charlemagne that "woman is the devil's gate, the way of iniquity, the scorpion's fang, a noxious race." Saint Bernard said "woman is the organ of the devil;" Saint Gregory, "woman has the asp's venom and the dragon's malice;" Saint Chrysostom, "woman is the sworn enemy of friendship, a miserable penalty, a necessary evil, a natural temptation, a domestic peril, a delectable harm; of all ferocious beasts," he adds, "not one is more dangerous than a woman;" Saint Cyprian, "woman is the envenomed birdlime with which the devil catches souls;" Saint Paulinus, "there are few good women, and the man who regards his happiness had

better keep out of their way ;”* Holding that almost inevitable dangers lie in that direction the Romanist doctors take special pains to put confessors on their guard. Accordingly their manuals contain chapters specially intended to caution, direct and shield them in their perilous tasks. What follows is translated from a chapter entitled “ What ought to be borne in mind in confessing the female sex.”† “ The confessor must have little to do with women, and in that little he must act cautiously and prudently. Let him, therefore, abstain from fixing his eyes on them, and from bland words which savour of carnal affection or may excite it. In hearing the confessions of women, says S. P. Ignatius, let them show themselves severe rather than familiar, though a certain paternal and spiritual gravity may appear in their manner. Next let not the confessor give easy credence to their complaints and tears, but rather exhort them to patience ; nor let him trust in their disclosures, but command them to keep God’s ordinances. Also out of the Confessional let him act circumspectly with them ; let him not sit alone with a woman in secret, or without a witness or companion ; let him never touch a woman’s hand, nor allow his own to be touched by a woman. He should, says Saint Isidore, keep his eyes fixed on the ground, and when he has said a few things to enlighten and restrain their souls, he should fly away immediately. The examination of young women requires attention to the same points as the examination of young men. Young women have, however, sins peculiar to themselves,

* *La Femme jugée par l’Homme*, Paris, 1858, p. 15.

† *Neo-Confessarius practice instructus a R. P. J. Reuter S. J. S. Theolog. in Universitate Trevirensi Doct. ac Prof. pub. : Edit. ter. Col. Agripp. : first pub. in 1749 with the imperial permission.*

especially if they are or think they are of a better condition in life, for some during a great part of the year sacrifice to pride and vanity in bedecking their bodies, and painting their faces ; they stand at their doors and frequent the church to see and be seen ; they are greedy for praise and honour ; when others are praised or honoured they are envious ; they hunt after luxury in dress ; they appear with their necks bare, so as to abash modest eyes ; they love visitings ; they waste time in amusements and gossip to the injury of the character of others as well as their own ; in the morning they sleep on till full day ; they neglect divine things, or enter the temple only near the end of the service ; their idol is personal gratification and display ; subject to sins of this nature, even when they are married they are intent on vanity more than on housewifery and their children's education."

The quotation furnishes the ground on which the saintly men, whose opinions of women are given above, proceeded in the views which they took. Celibacy is the source of the dangers, whether real or imaginary, and in whatever degree they exist. Next to celibacy the Confessional is answerable alike for the low views and the lax morality. The fact, though already sufficiently apparent, is illustrated by these additional undesigned testimonies. "This circumspection is still more necessary when the youth and the attire of the persons you confess, or the matters handled, or their great piety, or their art may more easily occasion bad impressions on their heart or on yours. Be not surprised, if among the dangers, I mention piety. It has more than once been the rock of imprudent confessors who beginning with an esteem quite spiritual were insensibly drawn on to a sensual and carnal affection. In order to

preserve yourself from so great a calamity you ought to abstain from every word indicative of tenderness. Thus, while you may say to a young man, *my dear son*, prudence requires you not to address a young woman as *my dear daughter*. You will be the more concise with persons of the other sex in the degree in which they shall disclose to you great weaknesses and faults in the matter of impurity. If brevity and austerity of language are necessary in the Confessional, how much more ought you to make them your law when out of the Confessional you speak to women of their spiritual demeanour. Here especially you ought to be on your guard. The venerable Avila never admitted a female to confer with him in his abode; it was always and only in the Confessional, and seated on a bench. Thus your first precaution is a *place* not isolated and solitary but open to the eyes of all the world; this will show the rectitude of your intentions; the second precaution is, to the guarding of your heart add that of the tongue and that of the eyes. You must not allow females to come to speak to you face to face, much less to kiss your hand. When you confess them you must appear not to know them. There are some who pretend to be very pious, and who perceiving they are known by the confessor do not accuse themselves sincerely. 'In order to form an attachment between religious persons,' said the venerable P. Sertorio Caputo, 'the devil begins by employing the pretext of virtue; then, the attachment being formed, he causes them to pass from the love of virtue to the love of the person.' Whence this advice of Saint Augustin, reported by Saint Thomas (Aquinas), 'With women let your words be few and cold; nor are they less to be guarded against because they are more saintly, for the more saintly they are the more they

allure.' How many virtuous priests, victims of affections commenced by piety, have thereby lost piety and God himself. The confessor ought not to be so given to confess women as to refuse men when they present themselves. What a pity to see so many confessors spend a whole morning in confessing little devotées while they send away poor males or married women pressed with occupations."*

The implications in these passages both as to the female character and the dangers of the priest are too obvious to need and too painful to admit explanation. We content ourselves with one other illustration. Saint Francois de Sales is reputed to have possessed a singular skill in treating the cases of females. The following shows his sense of their needs and his way of ministering to them: "First, as the devotion of females is very liable to inconstancy, he at the beginning tried to strengthen their judgement and give firmness to their will, in order that they might acquire perseverance. Secondly, he exercised them in the practice of the virtues rather than in contemplation, making them serve God for a long time in the life of Martha before admitting them to the life of Mary. His maxim was that they ought to draw near to Jesus before they united with him; and serve him as a good master before they washed his feet with tears and were admitted to his bosom. Thirdly, he led them to put away every thing in their piety that was ridiculous or hateful, declaring that God cannot be in a soul without one's neighbour feeling its gentleness. As a fourth condition he required great simplicity; he often said that trickery is like a moth which fixes on womens' hearts to ruin them. As, however, their simplicity might easily degenerate into foolery, and make them fall into

*Gaume, *Manuel des Confesseurs*, p. 150, seq.

illusions, he wished that they should do nothing except under advice, because otherwise they put themselves in peril of taking dreams for revelations, and of imitating spiders who pass their whole existence in weaving cobwebs in which they take nothing but flies. He also forbade them to indulge curiosity, and to abstain from objects not bearing on the fulfilment of the duties of their condition, and which could only inflate their hearts.”*

The worship of “the virgin,” one ideal of Romanism, is intimately connected with the existence and influence of the other ideal, namely, a bachelor priesthood; sentiments natural to the human heart, being denied their divinely intended utterance in marriage, turn into superstitious love for “Mary always Virgin.” But here we prefer borrowing the language of one, who living in the midst of Romanism, and having studied its inmost workings with the spirit of a Christian philosopher, is well fitted to speak of it with precision as well as authority.† “We know what the worship of the Virgin is for many priests—a delirious divinising of sentiments which their condition forbids them to address somewhere else; we know what with a great number of them those sentiments become—sentiments which they fancy pure after imagination has long sullied them. We know the encouragement for ignoble studies which hence results; we have opened them—opened speedily to close them—those books in comparison with which bad Romances are very harmless, and which serve as texts for instruction in theological seminaries; we know the place occupied in the mind of many

* Manuel des Confesseurs, p. 266.

† F. Bungener, “Marie et la Mariolatrié,” Genève, 1856.

a priest by meditations thereon—those depraved dreamings; we know by what questions they are transferred into the night of the Confessional; we know that scandals grossly material, become impossible, have been succeeded by an immense development of impurity in the heart. The priest who in the middle ages was straightforwardly dissolute was probably less injured than such and such a priest of the present day who pure in body feels himself justified by that purity to be impure in his thoughts. This—this is the secret reason of many studies on the Virgin. Some give themselves up to them with pleasure totally impure; others, the more pious, endeavour to persuade themselves that the sanctity of the goddess will sanctify in their hearts whatever pertains to her, or is done under her patronage; as to both, if an ordinary woman were to discover that her life had been the object or the occasion of such researches, she would see in the fact the extremest outrage, and have no feeling but horror for those who had engaged therein.”*

SECTION IV.

THE CONFESSIONAL—ITS ETHICS.

The ideals of the Confessional have been set forth. In those ideals its ethics are seen. Ethics are but customs thrown outwardly by our ideals. Our ideals forming our inner life are the matrix of our character, which is the outer expression of that inner life; hence the ethics of the Con-

* Bungener, *Marie et la Mariolatrie*; p.p. 53, 54.

fessional are by implication already known. In principle the character produced by the Confessional is declared in its ideals. Are those ideals right, true and acceptable? Then the character which grows out of them is right, true and acceptable. Otherwise the moral tendencies of the Confessional must be condemned. This is not a point of detail. We now speak of principles. The source of moral and spiritual life is found in the ideals of the Confessional. If that foundation is pure and limped—fresh from the bosom of the earth, fresh with the breezes of heaven, then Rome may justifiably claim the character of a holy church. But if the source is impure, muddy, earth all over and all through, sacerdotal not human, unnatural not natural, repressive not fostering, crushing not developing, a coercion not an education, then Rome is condemned, and her Confessional must be ranked with her own manacles, fetters, thumb screws, and similar monstrous instruments of force and torture.

The essence of the ideals of the Confessional is war against human nature. Man is a wild beast that must be tamed, and if he cannot be tamed he must be kept in chains. From whatever cause, human nature taken as a whole, is something not merely unreligious but irreligious. To become religious it must be coerced. Accordingly natural affections are, as such, irreligious, and can become religious only by being sacerdotalised. Hence the priest is the highest style of man, and the nun is the truly Christian woman. Accordingly not reasonable enjoyment but ascetic privation is man's best offering to God, and the service which God finds most grateful from man. From these principles flow all the mental crampings and bodily inflictions which mark the character of catholic education,

and sow its paths with thorns and briars. Hence, too, catholic intolerance. For how does the unsacerdotalised nature stand before the tribunal of catholic thought? It stands negatively as something destitute of real good, and positively as something actually and lastingly bad. The bad can be exorcised only by sacerdotalism; equally is the infusion of sacerdotalism the sole condition of its receiving the good. There is but one physician, namely, the priest. Apart from the priest you are lost, inevitably and eternally lost. But the priest never fails in his treatment. Once in his hands you are safe. Here then are two considerations of overwhelming importance,—on the one side vice and woe, measureless and endless; on the other side virtue and bliss, equally measureless and endless. The two are in the hands of the priest,—this and that he can bestow; this or that, which will you have? You hesitate? From the priest you will not take either? Then you must be forced—forced to be wise and happy. The priest knows you are wrong and now finds you to be perverse. However small then his benevolence it is enough to compel him to pluck you from ruin, and to make you richer than all the rich of the world, wiser than all its sages, more powerful than all its potentates, and more happy than all its gleeful children. These tremendous issues react with immense impulse and fearful momentum on the morality of Romanism. Hence the crushing pressures of its credal forces; hence its moral twistings and wrenchings; holding the salvation of the soul, in its sense, to be the first, last, highest, nay the sole consideration; it may well declare that the end sanctifies the means, and pronounce the cruelties of the rack the highest form of good will.

The strain of these reflections leads to the idea that as-

ceticism and casuistry are the principal qualities of Confessional ethics. The fact may receive a brief illustration. As the foundation of my remarks I ask Scavini for a definition of moral theology:

“Moral theology is that branch of theological study which directs human actions to virtue, by means at once proper and very safe, and regulates them so as to obtain eternal life. The means are.— 1: The scripture as interpreted by the church;—2: The ecclesiastical fathers; 3: The decrees of the popes;—4: The decisions of the councils;—5: Tradition;—6: The canon and the civil law; 7: The authority of theologians;—8: Reason both natural, i.e. as implanted in us by nature, and theological i.e. as imbued with theological principles.” Such is the morality of the Confessional as declared by Scavini.*

Now let us look a little closely into this definition. Morality has not for its essence or its source man's instinctive sentiments of right and wrong. Nor are these sentiments mentioned as concurrent with other sources of light and impulse, nor is the divine thought or the divine will in itself the ground of morality, nor is that ground to be looked for in the union of God's mind with the mind of man. Once more, the Scripture is not man's moral guide and director. It is only when the Scripture is interpreted by the church and seven other sources of light that the Scripture becomes man's moral code. Of these other sources of light natural reason is one, but as if to make that source as inconsiderable as possible it is supplemented or controuled by theological reason. But theological reason, or “reason imbued with theological principles,” is the mind of the priest. What else are the other authorities enumerated,

* *Theolog. Moralis Univ.* p. 15., Vol. I.

namely, "the ecclesiastical fathers," the decrees of the popes," "the decisions of the councils," "tradition," "the canon and the civil law," "the authority of theologians?" Hence it ensues that the ethics of the Confessional are a compound of sacerdotalisms interpreting reason and Scripture. Reason and Scripture therefore go for nothing until interpreted by this compound of sacerdotalisms. But the compound has a recognised representation in one general term, namely, "the church." Morality is then man's duty as taught by the church. But in every day life the church is practically the confessor. In consequence the Confessional makes it own morality. Instructions it does indeed receive—but whence? Not the Bible in itself, but the Bible as interpreted by the church. Hence the church is the real source of catholic morality. But the church means the priesthood. Accordingly the priesthood gives the law which it administers. But the law thus given and administered has in the system of Rome a divine sanction. Hence it ensues that the ethics of the Confessional are sacerdotalism, accompanied by the rewards and punishment of earth, of purgatory, and of heaven. A bare glance at the sources of interpretational light enumerated by Scavini, will justify the suspicion that the ethics of the Confessional are not the simple, earnest, wholesome ethics of common sense, sound-heartedness, scripture doctrine, but of the closet, the cloister, the cell. He who has any familiarity with the fathers, the popes, the councils, tradition, canon law, and the authority of theologians, knows that they all belong to dark, credulous superstitious periods of mediaeval history, when morality was confounded with asceticism and distracted and debased by casuistry. Indeed the attempt to revive the Confessional is an attempt to bring back the externalities

and subtleties by which of old priests led men to combine (as they fancied), positive irreligion and gross immorality, with a state of grace here and of eternal blessedness hereafter.

At the foundation of the asceticism of the church lies, as might be supposed, passive obedience. A Romanist has not the right to whip himself for his sins, unless he has received a command to that effect from his father confessor. Thus runs the instruction given to "the director of conscience." "At the beginning you will bid the penitent do nothing either contrary to or without your orders," 'those,' says Saint de la Croix, 'who perform acts of penance contrary to obedience advance in vice much more than in virtue'. Such acts however when commanded by the priest are not only useful but necessary. 'They have been practised more or less by all the saints. 'Do not' says the same authority, believe him who disapproves acts of penance, even if he had the gift of miracles'."

"The best mortifications, the most useful, and the least dangerous are the negative. These are examples—to deprive yourself of seeing or hearing curious things, to speak little, to be satisfied with food not to your taste or badly seasoned, not to warm yourself during winter, to choose the most worthless objects, to rejoice even when you lack some necessary thing; in this consists the virtue of poverty, according to that word of St. Bernard 'The virtue of poverty is not poverty, but the love of poverty;' not to complain of the rigours of the seasons, of contempts, of persecutions, of pains and infirmities. It is with the mallet of suffering that the stones of the heavenly Jerusalem are fashioned. Here arises a question: In one part the gospel says 'Let your light shine before men that they

may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven,' (Matt. v., 17); in another part it says 'When thou doest thine alms let not thy right hand know what thy left hand doeth,' (Matt. vi, 3). Accordingly it is asked whether we ought to show our good deeds or keep them hidden. I distinguish (make a distinction), deeds necessary to Christian virtue, ought to be practised publicly; as to frequent the sacraments, to make mental prayer, attend mass, to be serious and on your knees when so doing, to be modest with your eyes, to keep silence in church, to declare you wish to be saved, to avoid babbling, dangerous conversations, curiosity and the like. As to works of extraordinary supererogation, and which have some singularity in them—as to wear a hair shirt, to whip yourself, to pray with your arms crossed, to munch bitter herbs, to sigh, to weep in prayer,—these ye ought to keep as private as possible. The other deeds of virtue—as to serve the sick, to give alms to the poor, to humble yourself when you receive injuries, &c., it is better to keep them as much hidden as possible,"*

The quotation is full of instruction as to the spirit and the substance of Confessional morality. Its spirit is obedience—obedience to the priests, obedience to the confessor. This obedience running through the whole of human life determines the right exposition of scripture. Thus in a proposed scriptural difficulty the source of extrication is not the context, not the tenor of the passages, not the mind of Christ, but the will of the priest, who speaking *ex cathedra*, says, and so decides, "*I distinguish*," While passive obedience to the confessor is the spirit of Confessional, ethics on the part of the penitent, on the part of the con-

* Gaume, Manuel des Confesseurs p. 290 seq.

fessor it is casuistry. Christ commands us to conceal our good deeds. The command is simple as well as positive. But if literally obeyed it would interfere with deeds which are emphatically *the* good deeds of the Confessional, namely resorting to mass and the performance of other public observances. The ethics of the Confessional thus put in danger by the ethics of Christ, are saved by a Confessional distinction "I distinguish." But what is the effect of the distinction? It nullifies the master's command; for it makes pre-eminently virtuous acts which are of necessity public, while it reserves for privacy acts which are of necessity private, and so deprives the command of any bearing whatever on actual life. The real import of the commands is that Christian disciples should avoid display, studying to be righteous rather than to appear so, "doing the will of God from the heart," not from ostentation. Such virtues, being real and vital, could not fail to shine out in the life, and call forth in religious observers thanksgiving to God, the source of all virtue.

The substance of the ethics of the confessional is presented in the principle that mortifications, mortifications both of body and soul, are of the essence of Christian virtue. To abstain from warming your hands on a cold frosty day is as much an act of virtue as to succour the needy and console the dying. To love poverty is better than to augment wealth—though poverty entails dependence, begets pauperism, emaciates the frame, and shortens life, while wealth is the sure source of material prosperity, and may be made conducive to the highest spiritual good. Chiefly to be noted, and no less to be branded, is the nature of the distinction thus made by sacerdotal authority. Virtues are ranged in three classes: 1st, the necessary. What

are they ? to frequent the sacraments, to attend mass, &c.; 2nd, the supererogatory or the not-necessary. What are they ? to wear a hair shirt, to whip ycurself, &c. 3rd, Other deeds, what are they ? to serve the sick, to give alms, &c. Now of these three classes it may be affirmed that class first contains no virtues properly so called; class second contains vices, and class third contains virtues or vices as the circumstances may determine. Yet class one is the only class to which the epithet necessary is applied. To characterise these as "necessary to Christian virtue," and to characterise those as "the other deeds of virtue." is to declare that all deeds of virtue, except those pronounced necessary are, though deeds of virtue, not necessary. As not necessary they may be left unperformed without infringing the code of Christian virtue. Which is as much as to say that if you obey the priest, and hear mass, you in substance keep the law of God. If, however, all the enumerated acts be accounted so many virtues, then the externality of the ethics of the Confessional comes into full view, and of its ascetic qualities there can remain no doubt. In truth the real character of virtue as an act, or a life of obedience to the will of God, done from a loving regard to that will, as being the will of infinite goodness, is buried and hidden from sight under heaps of sacerdotal traditions and outward formalities. From such accumulations two additional specimens must suffice.

Among the means for reaching Christian perfection confessors are instructed to prescribe the following observances. "Three hours at least of mental prayer every day, that is one hour in the morning, one hour in the evening, and one hour after the communion. The last is specially important. Saint Theresa said that 'after the communion

the Saviour is in our hearts as on a throne of mercy to grant us his favours, addressing to us these words, ' what dost thou wish that I should do for thee? and in another place 'after the communion take care not to lose so good an opportunity of enriching yourself; His Majesty* is not accustomed to pay for his lodgings badly if he receives a welcome.' Visit the high altar and the holy virgin during half an hour; repeat the rosary with other vocal prayers; use frequent religious ejaculations; take the communion every morning; employ the whip on your naked body every day for about a quarter of an hour, and once or twice a month until you have fetched blood; wear the little chain from the morning until dinner, and during the whole day a little chain on the arm for a momento; fast on bread and water every Saturday; abstain from desert on Wednesdays and Fridays; never eat between meals; sleep not more than six hours; keep silence during three hours a day; put all your confidence in God, and absolutely distrust yourself and your good resolutions; endeavour to detach yourself from all—from parents, property, pleasure; avoid familiarity with the other sex, however pious they may be; rejoice intensely to see yourself despised, mocked, and looked on as the lowest of all: be perfectly obedient to the rules laid down for your direction by your superiors and to your confessor. Obedience is the queen of all the virtues, for all the virtues obey obedience. God demands of the soul which wishes to love him only obedience. Perfect obedience consists in obeying promptly, punctually, with good grace, blindly and without asking a reason, every time that the thing commanded is not an evident sin. This is the doctrine of François de

* God as transsubstantiated in the wafer and swallowed in the sacrifice of Mass. See under "Extreme Unction."

Sales, Saint Ignatius, (Loyola) and of all the masters of the spiritual life. In doubtful cases take the part which you presume obedience would dictate, and when you cannot form a presumption choose that which is most contrary to your tastes. A mortified soul profits more in a quarter of an hour's prayer than a soul not mortified does during many hours. Every year go through the ten-days' spiritual exercises, isolating yourself as much as possible. Spend in solitude one day every month. Cherish particular devotion toward Saint Joseph, your guardian angel, your patron saint; Saint Michael, universal protector of Christians: but above all toward the Holy Virgin, whom the church calls our life, our hope. It is morally impossible for a soul to make great progress in perfection without a tender and quite special devotion toward the mother of God. Let all be for the glory of Jesus Christ and of Mary conceived without sin. Such are the means of Christian perfection."*

As you yourself have to be subdued and chained, so the world around you is a desert to be endured, a prison to escape from, a pleasure to renounce. The two conceptions are combined in a letter addressed by Saint Jerome, (4th century), to Eustochium, in which also may be learnt the vanity of the attempt to eradicate the natural affections, and the fearful struggles, and waste of energy which the attempt occasions:

"The present life is a battle ground for all men. Here combats, there the crown. As long as we have to walk amid serpents we must not lay aside distrust. Everything here is full of hostilities; we encounter enemies at every step. Our frail flesh, destined to the dust into which it is shortly to fall, endures alone all the assaults of the powers

* Manuel des Confesseurs, 299 seq.

combined against us. How often, since I fixed my abode in this desert,* this vast solitude, which, devoured by ceaseless burning, presents only the most savage sights, how often have I transported myself into the bosom of Rome and its delights. Plunged in an abyss of bitterness I sank to the bottom of my cell. A rough sack covered my hideous body; my skin blackened, dried, bore the appearance of one of those men who are burnt by the ardors of the suns of Ethiopia, and gave me the livid figure of a corpse. All day was I in tears and groans, and if during the night sleep sometimes in spite of my resistance closed my eyes, scarcely had I the strength to uphold my sinking frame. I say nothing to you of my food. In the desert even the sick drink water only; it would be a sort of sensuality to take anything that had been subject to the fire." Yet, this same man who to escape the flames of hell had condemned himself to be buried in this prison, where he had for companions only wild and poisonous beasts, was by his imagination carried into the midst of the dances of the Roman maidens. Under a countenance emaciated by perpetual fasting, and in a body already dead before its dissolution, there burned a soul full of guilty recollections, and boiling with desires and regrets. "Imploring aid, and knowing not where to find a refuge against myself, I came and went; exhausted, I fell at the foot of the cross, which, bathed with my tears in floods, I wiped with my hair, contending against the revolts of my flesh with the rudest severities. I do not blush to avow my misery; far from it. I groan at being no longer what I was then. I remember to have often passed nights in beating my breast until the Lord, scattering the tempest, had restored calm to my

* Of Judea on the east of Bethlehem, along the Dead Sea.

senses. Meanwhile I approached my cell even only with fright, as if it knew my thoughts, and arming myself against myself with wrath and indignation I went to thrust myself into the deepest recesses of my solitude. At other times wandering on the summits of mountains, lost in the obscurities of the valley, or in caves and dens of rocks, I gave myself to prayer and mortified this guilty flesh. After my tears had flowed in abundance,—after my eyes had long rested on the heavens, more than once I believed I was transported among angelic choirs, and in the extacies of ineffable joy, I cried ‘We run after you, attracted by the odour of your perfumes.’”

The morality of the Confessional is asceticism. It has another principal feature, namely, casuistry. Casuistry has its name from the cases of conscience which Roman sacerdotalism undertakes to decide. In purely Christian morals and in the ordinary Christian life, the rule of duty is for the most part clear. A few simple facts, and a few great principles, having for their ground and reason the primal realities—God, conscience, scripture and Christ,—suffice to guide the Christian into all moral truth, and that so readily and with so much attendant certainty that he is well assured it is not so much knowledge as power that he lacks in the discharge of his duty. Were his will as strong as his mind is instructed, he would stand much less distant from the perfection to which he has the privilege of being called. When Jesus declared “I am the way, the truth and the life,” he gave his disciples a rule of duty equally obvious, simple and attractive. But Romanism, not content with the light of the world himself, kindles tapers of its own making, and shows a preference for their dim, diverse and flickering rays. Substituting its own

interpretations of the Bible for the Bible itself, it introduces confusion ten times confounded. Not content to ask what Christ did or said, it enquires what Saint Thomas has laid down, what the pope has decreed, what the councils have determined, and finally, what the doctors in general decide. These doctors—whose name is legion—bear the name of Casuists. They are for the most part members of the society of Jesus, and so are commonly called Jesuits. The Jesuits or disciples of the Spanish warrior turned fanatic, Ignaz Loyola, are *par excellence*, the moralists of the Romish church. What they teach is practically catholic law and catholic duty. Hence the morality of the Confessional is Jesuitism. The character of that morality is declared by the ill odour of that name. The civilised world—not being Romanist—marks its condemnation of the ethics of the Confessional by the opprobrium it has fixed on the very appellation Jesuitism. Nor indeed without reason. Jesuitism and casuistry call up in the mind perversion, straining, subtlety, refining and hairsplitting in moral science, which, thus made unnatural and perverted, becomes false, misleading and baneful. One of the rank and overwhelming growths of this system is probabilism.

Two steps are before you, and you hesitate which to set or whether you should set either. Call them G. and H. In favour of G. there is some probability—it is probably the right step; if probably the right step you would actually think it as probably the safe step; but the Confessional distinguishes between the right and the safe; the right respects the law as commanding or forbidding G.; the safe respects your liberty as performing or not performing G. It is probable then that the law commands you to perform G., but it is more probable that your not performing G. is safer in relation to yourself, for by performing that

which is merely probable you may commit a sin. But sin and safety exclude each other. Hence you must take the safe course rather than the probable one. Thus the more probable safety carries the day over the less probable duty. Let H. now come into the field. There is an option between G. and H.—which am I to take? G. is the more probable, but H. is the more safe. I am free then to take H. and leave G. My liberty carries the day over the law. These distinctions are in Confessional ethics carried out through all the forms and degrees of probable, more probable, most probable; less probable, least probable; safe, more safe, most safe, less safe, least safe; not only in themselves but in their several combinations, so as to produce a minutely ramified system of ethics, which in practice darkens the moral perceptions, and confounds the ideas of right and wrong. The system works the more disadvantageously on two accounts: first, because it is built on an institutional foundation—law not right; precepts, not eternal realities, being its basis; and secondly, because the safe, as contrasted with the lawful, is full of peril. The safe, if consistently regarded, may indeed nullify action, for amid the varying quantities of more or less probable, it cannot fail to be often safer not to act than to act. What noble daring, too, can there be when safety obtrudes as an element into our considerations, and may, at least in lower natures, start into sudden ascendancy, or gain lasting dominion? The safe is the useful under another form, and the useful judged by myself may easily appear in the shape of the convenient, the politic, the profitable; and so self is encouraged to stand up against God. Accordingly Jesuitism has often proved too strong for Jesus, and the pope has been served by papists more thoroughly than he wished or liked.

Probabilism has been prolific in controversies a history of which would confound the claim of unity put forward by Romanism. Scavini, who urges the necessity of the use of casuistry in the Confessional, divides the principal combatants into two classes—first, “those who”—(I translate his words literally)—“stand more or less in doubt for the opinion which favours the law;” second, “those who stand more or less in doubt for the opinion which favour the liberty of the individual.” In the first class are fifty-seven distinguished authors, in the second one hundred and one. Writing, as the professor does, a work for the guidance of his university scholars, he, after a full and learned exposition of the principles of the matter, and after enumerating with characterising remarks the great authorities, bids the young men, choose what and whom they follow as they please.—(Vol. 1, p. 97.) So then after all, the guidance of this infallible church fails in those very points where difficulties, either real or factitious, make guidance specially desirable.

In the second class we find the name of Escobar, from whose writings,* specially designed for the instruction of confessors, we shall extract a few illustrative specimens, passing by many too indecent to appear here, yet sufficient of themselves to ensure the condemnation of the Confessional if only for the pollutions in which its conductors wallow :

“When two opinions, of which one is favourable to the law and the other to liberty, are equally or almost equally probable, it is clear that the law is uncertain and doubtful, for then equal reasons make for and against the law : but a doubtful and uncertain law cannot give rise to a

Liber Theolog. Moralis; Brussels, 1651: up to which time this work had appeared in thirty-two editions in Spain, and three in France.

certain obligation. In such a case you may follow the course which is less safe.

Q.—“May a physician, having a supply of medicines, furnish the less certain and leave the more certain?” A.—“A physician not having a medicine certain to cure, supplies a medicine which may probably cure, it being more probable that it will do harm. He does not sin, because what is done from a probable reason cannot be blamed.

Q.—“May a judge in giving sentence follow a probable opinion a more probable opinion being set aside?” A.—“Yes, provided the probable opinion concerns the law and not the fact, for in regard to facts you are bound to follow the more probable.”

Q.—“A difference of opinion arises between a sovereign and a subject, ought the subject to obey?” A.—“Yes,” says Salas, “as far as he can without sin.” But Castro Palao declares that when a subject relies on a probable opinion that the command is unlawful, or beyond the jurisdiction of the sovereign, he is free not to obey, because it is lawful for any one to follow a probable opinion.

Q.—“Can the pope give a dispensation for a marriage between a brother and sister?” A.—Praepositus denies that he can because it is the first degree of relationship forbidden by the law of nature. But Hurtado affirms that such a marriage is valid by the law of nature, and may on just grounds be allowed by the pope, e.g. if the King of Spain could not form an equal foreign match unless with a heretic or one suspected of heresy.” “If however the pope were to reply that he could not give a dispensation within the degrees prohibited by the law of God?” “You would have to explain that he meant that he ought not to do so without a considerable reason.”

"A promise is binding—but not if matters are changed so that if you had foreseen them so changed you would not have made the promise; nor if you did not intend to bind yourselves but merely proposed to do it. For scarcely does any one of those who make promises intend to bind himself unless he takes an oath and confirms it by an instrument. Therefore when they say 'I will do it,' they mean they will do it unless they change, for they wish to enjoy liberty. But he who has a design to promise binds himself thereby. If however he does not fulfil the promise from a cause which seems reasonable to himself, he does not commit a mortal sin, unless in some other way scandal ensues, or a serious injury to his neighbour. A person may also refuse a thing promised to a person who does not perform what he promised to the same, also when it is pernicious to himself to perform it, or useless to him to whom he promised it; or if the promise was extorted by force and not confirmed by an oath; or if the promise was made to one who has been excommunicated."

"Is it lawful to induce a person to take a false oath which oath he who takes it in ignorance believes to be true?" Azorius denies that it is on the ground that we ought to avoid a crime in others. But Hurtado declares that it is lawful because the person sins in form only and not in substance."

"Is it a deadly sin to swear in equivocal words without a just cause?" 'Yes' says Lessius, 'No' says Sanchez with more probability."

"Are false oaths uttered from bad habits inadvertently mortal sins?" 'Yes' declares Torres; but others deny it with probability."

"I am a creditor of a prince; I cannot obtain payment;

am I free to abstract taxes in compensation?" "you may; this doctrine holds good in tithes and other dues."

"Does a servant sin mortally when he takes from his master something considerable?" "Yes unless his master is unreasonably hard with him, e. g., does not supply him with necessaries, for then the servant has a right to assist himself."

"When a person is by fraud led to a spiritual contract, e. g., to become a monk or to enter into marriage,—is he bound to fulfil it?" "Yes, unless the fraud was of such a nature that a prudent man might have been deceived thereby, for then it is to be held that the will to make the contract was lacking."

We supply two or three other illustrations of the ethics of the Confessional from almost equally eminent authorities.

"To open and read letters is often not a sin, if on probable grounds you know that they have been written with a view to do you a harm which you have not deserved, or will act to injure you in a way which you are striving to prevent; for you have a right to take steps for your own good. Thus a prince may open the letters not only of an enemy but of others who in time of war come from countries near that of his enemy. Also public servants may do so as often as they judge it necessary for the public good."—*Busenbaum*.

"A person from whom you ask a loan of money may with an oath declare he has it not when in reality he has it, understanding in his secret thought that he has it not to lend, since he is not obliged to lend."—*Sanchez*.

"Father Fagandez in his ninth book on the Decalogue, speaks thus: It is lawful for a son to rejoice at the death of his father killed by him when in liquor, because he will

to possession of great wealth, regard being
ult rather than the causes.”—*Vasquez*.

al to poison a tyrant ?” “It is glorious to ex-
terminate all this deadly and destructive race. For certain
members are cut off, if rotten, lest the other parts of the
body be inflicted : so this beastly ferocity in human shape
ought to be removed from the body politic. With open
force and arms a tyrant may be killed ; that is clear. “ But
secretly ?” There is greater strength of mind in openly rush-
ing on the foe of your country ; but it is not less a mark
of wisdom to select your spot for snares. “ The question
however is whether you may employ poison for the pur-
pose ?” Where is the difference between the sword and
poison, especially since it is conceded that you may employ
secret means ?”—*Mariana*.*

We have reserved to the last the following, which, taken
from the authoritative constitutions of the society of Jesus,
shows that Jesuitism is captured by its own snares, being
first bound in passive obedience to its head, and then led to
suppose it possible that sin could be authorised by the
sinless Jesus.

“ No constitutions can introduce an obligation to a mortal
or a venial sin, *unless the superior commands it in the name of
our Lord Jesus Christ, or in virtue of obedience.*”*

The dictum may be expressed thus: “ When your supe-
rior commands you to commit a mortal or a venial sin in
the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in virtue of obedi-
ence, the laws of the society of Jesus make the command
obligatory on you, but under no other supposable condi-

* Joannes Marianæ Hispani e Societate Jesu, 1605.

* Constitutiones cum Declarationibus Societatis Jesu, VI Pars,
cap. V.

tions." Whence it is manifest that in Jesuitism the mind and will of the superior is the ethical tribunal of the last resort. This tribunal, from which there is no appeal, possesses the function of making sin obligatory in certain specified cases, that is, it takes from sin its sinfulness, and of that sin thus rendered sinless it makes Christ the sanction and the minister. The superior who enjoys this prerogative, which changes the eternal relations of things, is the officer who in any case stands above his associates, and is finally the general of the society. This command, though it puts a dagger into my hand and commands me to assassinate my queen, my friend, my brother, I am bound to obey, because in the order I stand lower than he.

We conclude the chapter with the painful conviction that the casuistry of Rome is a radical vice in its constitution. Sorry are we to add that the conviction is the inevitable result of long, deep, and we may say conscientious studies of Romanism, no less in its highest authorities than its actual workings. Dishonesty is a marked feature in the Romish church. Without attempting to set forth our conviction in detail, we borrow for its utterance the words of one who is most familiar with "this mystery of iniquity,"—which God yet suffers on earth for his own inscrutable purposes,—and who has published several works, whence may be obtained a clearer and truer view of the Confessional as it has been and as it is than from any other easily accessible source known to us.*

"Your superiors and your friends are unfortunately peo-

* See Bungener's "History of the Council of Trent;" A Sermon under Louis XIV.; "Three Sermons under Louis XV.;" "Notes on the Principal Passages of the New Testament which combat the Errors of the Church of Rome."

ple in whose eyes the end justifies the means. They would neither say all you say, nor write all you write, but they are very glad that some one says it and writes it. Accordingly whatever you say or do, they will never disavow; no catholic journal will utter a word against you any more than you will utter a word against the monstrous falsities, which this or that periodical in Savoy or any where else may put forward. This collusive system extends from the highest to the lowest ranks,—every thing that serves the cause is good, is true. The pope will continue to proscrib and curse liberty of every kind, but he will think it excellent that you should utter liberal tirades, and that at Geneva you should put them forth as catholic and as approved. The pope will denounce as revolutionary the most innocent movement of reform and progress, but he will allow you to approve and caress the most brutal revolutions the moment their sanguinary passage offers you something you may glean. The pope will encourage in Italy all the persecutions which the spirit of the age permits, but he will approve your maintaining that he has never persecuted nor praised those who did persecute. The pope will give himself out for the inflexible guardian of catholic doctrine, but he will let you modify and arrange it, he will let you veil this, veil that, have one catholicism for men, another for women, one for the well instructed, another for the people, one for catholics, another for protestants. The pope will more rigorously than ever interdict the Bible, but he will think you perfectly justified in declaring that he does not interdict it, that he has never interdicted it. What I say of the pope I say of you all; never will you condemn each other for having done what it was useful to do in a certain country or at a given moment. In politics you are

for the highest bidder ; In religion you are the most terrible or the most indulgent of men ; to day all gall, to morrow all honey ; widening or narrowing the road ; reasoning or thundering against reason, invoking the Bible or concealing it ; anathematising or blessing alike men and things, as fast as the wind turns in this direction or in that. The church, the church first, truth afterwards, and if the truth lends itself not to the church, so much the worse for the truth."*

SECTION V.

THE CONFESSIONAL—ITS MARIOLATEY.

In the theological system of the Confessional one notion has obtained ascendancy above all others. If systems of thoughts may be designated by their dominant idea Romanism would be more properly called Maryism. The Virgin Mary sits on the throne of the Catholic Olympus, casting other powers, however venerable and august, into the shade in the popular estimation.

It is by a gradual and interrupted progress that this pre-eminence has been attained. Of the apotheosis there is no trace in scripture. Its account of Mary the mother of Jesus is fragmentary, brief and simple. Near the termination of the reign of Herod, mis-named the great, Mary, betrothed to Joseph, became pregnant under a specially divine influence, and in due time bore a son to whom the name Jesus was given. In the interval she had paid a visit to

* Bungener "*Marie et la Mariolatric*," p.p. 56, 7, 8.

Elizabeth her cousin, and had entered into wedlock with Joseph. The birth took place at Bethlehem, whither Joseph and Mary had gone in consequence of a decree issued by Augustus Cæsar, directing his subjects to submit to a census, and so requiring the heads of each family to repair to the place of their origin. Immediately after the birth the child was visited by some Bethlehemite shepherds, who had been told of the event by angels rejoicing thereon. Their visit and that of some Magi from the east, moved the young mother greatly, and "she kept all these things and pondered them in her heart." In due time Joseph and Mary presented the child in the temple. Alarmed at enquiries made by the sanguinary Herod, they fled into Egypt, taking Jesus with them. On Herod's death they returned into their native land and settled in Nazareth. Here they remained until Jesus reached his twelfth year, when he was taken to the festival of the passover at Jerusalem. The solemn rites being ended, the family took steps to return home, but at the close of the first day's travel Jesus is missed. Thereon Joseph and Mary hasten back to Jerusalem and find Jesus discussing with learned Jews in the temple. He is gently reprovèd by his mother, and the three go back to Nazareth. From that day until her son is engaged in his public ministry Mary is lost from view. Shortly after its commencement the fourth Gospel makes her appear at a marriage feast given at Cana in Galilee, where she induces Jesus to convert water into wine. During the labours of his ministry Jesus receives one visit from Mary. When at last he hangs on the cross, he discerns his mother not far from its foot, and commends her to his favourite disciple John, by whom she is provided with a home. Her last appearance on the

evangelical scene is with the apostles in Jerusalem, engaged in prayer and supplication prior to the outpouring of the spirit. The qualities which in the scriptural narratives belong to Mary are piety, gentleness, thoughtfulness, motherly care and tenderness—noble qualities, which must have acted on Jesus in his early days most beneficially. Jesus in no way associates his mother with his mission. (John II, 4.) He even seems to stand aloof from her and the other members of the family, as if fearing that his work might in any way be lowered by an earthly element. Certainly he took special care to show that the relations which were highest in his sight were the spiritual, for when told by the multitude “Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without seeking thee,” he replied, “who is my mother or my brethren?” And he looked round about on them which sat near him and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! for whosoever shall do the will of God the same is my brother and my sister and mother,” (Mark III, 31 seq.)

This is the substance of the biblical narrative respecting Mary the mother of Jesus. Our business here is not to criticise but to report the account; and the account doubtless makes Mary to have borne Jesus without ceasing to be a virgin.

Never, however, does the scripture refer to Mary by the Romanist title of “the virgin.” Nor does it afford the slightest colour to the Romanist designation of her as “Mary always virgin.” On the contrary, it describes Jesus as “her first-born son,”* (Luke ii, 7) literally “of her *the* son,

* According to the *Textus Receptus*, Matthew (I, 25) bears the same testimony, but the epithet “first-born” is disallowed by Tischendorf.

the first-born"* and speaks of the brothers and sisters of Jesus in such a manner as to show that she was the mother of a large family. (Matt. XII, 46, XIII, 56 ; Mark III, 31, VI, 3 ; Luke VIII, 19 ; John VII, 5 ; Acts II, 14.)

Very early did the simple facts attending on the birth of Jesus become environed by mythical elements ; and these have gone on increasing from age to age down to the present century. The repositories of these elements are first, the Apocryphal gospels, then the writings of Ecclesiastics, and finally, the decrees of Synod and Councils. In a general way the church, that is the outer and visible church, and in particular the church of the popes, is the bosom in which the Virgin Mary was born into the divinity which is now the preferred object of worship throughout the Confessionaldom of the world. The more marked phases of that modern metempsychosis must be here set down. In Jesus, as is commonly contemplated, there are two natures, the human and the divine. The divine he derived from the Holy Spirit, the human from Mary his mother. Mary as a woman was a descendant of Adam, and as a descendant of Adam, she bore the taint of her origin in what is termed original sin. Derived from her, as to his human nature, Jesus her son, in that nature laboured under the same taint. This position, the church rejected. But how was the taint precluded ? If a miracle was requisite for the purpose it might have been wrought at the point where the taint of Mary was about to enter the life of her son. But what was that point ? Theological speculation could not agree in a reply. To leave the matter here would be to leave it in a very delicate position. Better shut out the filthy stream higher up than let it come so near to the sacred spot. The earliest thought was

to declare Anna, the apocryphal mother of Mary, to have been conceived without sin. If she were sinless her daughter would be sinless. This, the invention of the oriental church, did not find favour with the western; which contented itself with the theory that Mary, the mother of Jesus, was conceived without sin, and so bore a sinless child. This, however, which was at first a mere theory, finds no countenance in the early ages. Late and tardily did the theory come into substantive existence. The title *God-bearer* (*Theotokos*) denotes the first marked step toward the divinisation of Mary, and this was not given to her before the fifth Constantinopolitan Synod, held in the middle of the sixth century.* This step, however, involved every other. If Mary is the mother of God, Mary so far surpasses all ordinary human beings as to be describable only by divine attributes, and to be worthy of divine honours, at least in the logic of imaginal devotion. By degrees, the epithet god-bearer entailed a god-mother, and so added a divinity to the pantheon of paganised Christianity. The immaculate conception of one already recognised as a divinity was a small matter, especially when necessitated by the rigorous demands of a systematic theology. The notion, however, took a long time to gain acceptance. Augustin, in the fourth century, represented Mary as dead in Adam on account of sin. Fancy, however, saw in scripture that Jeremiah (I, 5) and John the Baptist (Luke I, 15) were sanctified in their mother's womb, and, as Mary the god-bearer, stood above all the saints, she must of course have shared the privilege. Yet the notion did not prevent Anselm in the twelfth century from declaring that Mary was not only begotten

* Suiceri Thes. Eccles. n verbo.

but born in sin. Not till the middle of that century did some canonists lay it down as law that she was conceived without sin, and institute a festival in commemorative of the event. They were, however, opposed by Bernhard of Clairvaux, who declared the doctrine contrary to tradition, church usage and reason. Christ only, he said, was conceived without sin, though Mary was sanctified in her mother's womb, and remained sinless. The distinction is a nice one in more than one sense. We shall not follow the doctors into those dark recesses of their systematic speculations. It may be enough to say that the great authority among the Romanist schoolmen, Thomas Aquinas, assented to the view taken by Bernhard. The festival, however, once established gained general acceptance. In the thirteenth century it was formally adopted by the Franciscan friars, but merely as commemorative of Mary's conception, its sinlessness being left aside. In the next century, however, one of their great doctors, Duns Scotus, led by the exigencies of system, set himself in opposition to Bernhard, and at length declared that Mary was at the time of her conception preserved from the stain of original sin. Here there was a clear issue, a possible "yes" or "no." In the pugnacious spirit of the age the issue was taken up on the side of Scot, by the Franciscans hence called Scotists; and on the side of Thomas by their rivals the Dominicans, hence called Thomists. In the heat of the contest Mary herself interposed and decided in favour of her immaculate conception. This she did in revelations made to the Franciscan nun, Brigit of Sweden, (died 1373) afterwards pronounced a saint (1391). Unfortunately this source of information was questioned at the time, but it is probably as reliable as the bulk of the matter we have

in hand. Certainly the Dominicans are not convinced nor yet confuted, for still did they maintain the fight. Some of them in the heat of controversy went so far as to impute to the virgin sin and defilement, and to ask their opponents "Do you mean to make Mary into a goddess?" At length a decisive step was taken by Gerson, who, notwithstanding his reformatory tendencies, not only pronounced in favour of the Franciscan view, but put out a very opportune theory, which helped forward the growing notion, and which, in the hands of the catholic Möhler, has modified the old doctrine of tradition, and given it the now accepted form of developement. Gerson's position is that revelation is progressive, and that the church, as the organ of the Holy Spirit, receives from time to time new disclosures of divine truth. Here is the justification of the doctrine of the Franciscans, and of any other novelty. The church is a living womb, pregnant with spiritual embryos, which in due time come to the birth, and so add new objects of faith, and it may be of adoration, to her treasures. From the days of Gerson down to those of Pio Nono, the church was bearing the new divinity. The process, though long, has only one marked distinction. Already did the church commemorate the conception of the immaculate Mary. The only possible step in the order of the developement for so many centuries in progress, was to convert this position into the immaculate conception of Mary. I put the two in parallel lines that their exact difference may be seen,—

the conception of the immaculate Mary.

the immaculate conception of Mary.

The matter at issue was the right position of the adjective immaculate; should it precede "Mary" or "Conception"? The smaller the difference the more violent the zeal of the

respective partisans. The heats were anything but lessened when the Jesuits came into the ring, and pushing aside the Franciscans, took their place, and showed such an array of battle against the Dominicans as to put the final result beyond a question. For a long while the papal See acting warily, as it is wont when it finds itself surrounded by contending forces, satisfied itself with warding off all imputations of sin, from the God-bearer. But the zeal of jesuitism and the peril of the church brought a new era. "The glories of Mary," as the Jesuit Liguori, entitled the piece he published in order to quicken the too sluggish popular mind and to hasten the birth, came on all sides in the catholic church to absorb attention, inflame imagination, inspire tongues, and set pens in motion. What indeed could stand against Liguori's argumentation.—Was it not proper that God the Father should exempt Mary from original sin and create her in a state of grace seeing she was his eldest daughter? (Prov. VIII, 2 seq.) Was it not proper that God the son should do the same seeing she was to be his mother. Was it not proper that God the Holy Ghost should do the same seeing that he had chosen her to be his wife? During the Pontificate of Gregory XVI, events were obviously repening for an authoritative decision. The General Vicar of the pope formally proclaimed the immaculate conception. Permission was given in special cases to designate the conception of Mary as immaculate in certain forms of public worship. Even the General of the Dominicans obtained (1843.) permission to introduce into the churches of his order the office and mass of the conception. This showed that the end was near. Pius IX, took his seat in Saint Peter's chair with a nature prone to romance, and with sensibilities which made his

religion a sentiment more than a creed. All his religious affections concentrated themselves in devotion towards Mary; for had he not when a youth been cured by her of the epilepsy, and so was enabled to receive priestly consecration! His time of trouble came. He had to flee for his life from the holy city, when, as he believed, the Virgin in visible appearance held her shield before him, and so he escaped impending incarceration.

While the pope remained in exile at Gaeta, he addressed (Feb. 2, 1849) to all the chief shepherds of the church a circular, in the introduction of which he remarked :—

“ From the time when we took our seat in the apostolic chair, it has been a great comfort to us to know that under Gregory XVI, (his predecessor), a strong desire had become active in the whole catholic world that at length it might be determined by a solemn declaration from the apostolic see, that the holy God-bearer, our most beloved mother, was begotten without the stain of original sin.”

Farther on he gives the assurance that—

“ From our earliest youth we accounted nothing so worthy and so dear as with special childlike devotion and with our whole heart to honour the blessed Virgin Mary, and to promote everything which tended to her praise and glory, and by which her worship might be more and more spread abroad.”

On that account from the beginning of his pontificate he had prayed to God for light, in order that he might know what in the circumstance he ought to do.

At the end a most earnest wish is expressed that the honoured brethren “ would at the earliest period supply information of the devotion with which the clergy and the faithful cleaved to the immaculate conception of the

Virgin, and how the desire found utterance that the holy See might come to a final determination."

Finally, in the apostolical letter issued to restore the Roman hierarchy in this country (Sept. 24, 1850) we read :—

" While we were allowing this plan to ripen, we have not failed to entreat the aid of God ; we have also sought assistance from the most holy Virgin Mary, the mother of God, and from the saints, who have made England glorious by their virtues, that they, by their mediation with God, would condescend to obtain for us the successful issue of this undertaking."

The appeal thus made in Rome for the spiritual subjugation of this protestant land by the special aid of the Virgin, was taken up and repeated here. In a pastoral issued by the Bishop of Melipotamus, " On the pope's encyclical letter on the mystery of the immaculate conception," Cardinal Wiseman among others makes these statements :—

" To no part of the catholic church can this announcement be more welcome than to us, dearly beloved, whose fathers so particularly held and promoted belief in this mystery of Mary's immaculate conception, and gave to the church the feast in which it is commemorated. Who then shall feel more anxious than we to learn the decision of so great a point, the sure holding of which has been already a source of so many blessings to the church ? It is in truth a solemn and most moving occurrence, when the church of God, not aroused from without by the assaults of heresy, nor alarmed within by the creeping spread of baneful error, but moved and uplifted by the heaving and swelling piety of her own best children, rises up to

declare a dogma of faith. The month of May, sacred in the church to the most blessed mother of God, comes most opportunely to favour the discharge of this most pleasing duty—the prayers of the faithful for guidance in the matter; we trust that in every church or chapel in our district some devotion will be performed and instruction will be given with reference to the peculiar dedication of the month to Mary, the immaculate virgin Mother of God.”

“Anxious, therefore, to unite the particular object of prayer enjoined by the holy father with the annual and more general devotion of the season, the bishops, vicars apostolic of all England, assembled according to their wont in London, have unanimously resolved to address their flocks, that so there may be a uniform and joint supplication sent up to the throne of grace.”

The appeal made nominally to the catholic world, but really to its hierarchy, brought a result less favourable than might have been expected, especially when the pains are considered that were taken to kindle zeal for the Marian idolatry in all parts of Romandom. The Cardinal Schwarzenberg, the bishops Ermeland and Paderborn, the prince, bishop of Breslau, saw no reason which demanded the decision and considered the time unfavourable. Sibour, archbishop of Paris, held it untheological to raise this pious opinion into an article of faith. About three-fourths of the bishops of the whole church spoke in agreement with the declared wish of the pope. Something this very different from unanimity, especially when the laity had no direct voice in the matter. However, the pope was impressible and the Jesuits urgent.* In 1848, Perrone had in a complete essay on the subject undertaken to prove

*Pii Noni, P. M. Acta p. 162 seq.

that the question was ripe for decision. Passaglia published a most elaborate work in favour of the virgin's claim. Any hesitation that may have lingered in the mind of Pio Nono was removed when he found his view supported by the commission of inquiry he had appointed. He, therefore, in the autumn of 1854 convened a number of prelates. Fifty-four cardinals and one-hundred-and-forty bishops came together. They held a preliminary meeting, and loudly greeted the decision of the pope, as if then, for the first time, they were aware of his pleasure. On the 8th of December of the same year, the pope was carried in solemn procession into St. Peter's Church. Arriving there he ascended the throne, wearing the triple crown. Then the dean of the sacred college approached, and in the name of longing Christendom entreated a definitive decision respecting the conception of Mary. Her son's viceroy replied that in order to have power to listen to the prayer, he must first seek the aid of the Holy Ghost. The *Veni Creator* was accordingly sung. Then the pope read the long prepared decree, the substance of which was that in the first moment of her conception the Virgin Mary was preserved free from all stain from original sin, by a special act of grace on the part of God Almighty, in view of the merits of Christ. This decision determines the future mission of the Confessional, and that mission under its direction can be one only of direct and defiant hostility to Protestantism. The decision breaks down the last remnant of the bridge over which a union of the two churches, the catholic and the Protestant, might by bare possibility have been effected. The worship of a new divinity is a step for which Protestantism will not be prepared so long as it retains a residue of its own proper spirit. The

decree is indeed a proclamation of war against all forms of Christianity without the pale of the Roman church. The proclamation is made with full design and in open day. Rome has thrown away the scabbard. Impelled by Jesuitism, the pope has ventured his all on one cast, determined in the spirit of the inveterate gambler, to win all or lose all. Accordingly the very next day he delivered an allocution, in which, overflowing with joy and confidence, he hurls the bolt he has thus got into his hands at the several bands of his principal foes, not forgetting some in his own church, who were so far gone from catholic verity as to hope for the salvation of good men beyond their own communion. These are Pio Nono's words :—

“Another and not less deadly error we learn, not without grief, has seized some portions of the catholic world, and so settled in the minds for the most part of catholics, who think that a hope is to be entertained of the eternal salvation of those who do not abide in the true church of Christ. Therefore they are often accustomed to inquire what, after death, will be the lot and condition of those who are not attached to the catholic faith; and having adduced the idlest reasons, expect an answer in accordance with their own perverse notion. Far from us be the idea of setting bounds to the divine mercy which is infinite; but, as our apostolic office requires, we desire, venerable brethren, to call forth your episcopal care and vigilance, so that you may with all your energies drive from the minds of men that impious and deadly opinion, namely, that the way of eternal safety may be found in any religion. For it is to be held as an article of faith that out of the apostolic Roman church no one can be saved, that she is the only ark of salvation, and that he who does not enter that ark will

perish in the deluge. Go over in your minds how those ancient defenders of the catholic faith gained the victory over the most pernicious heresies, while united one with the other, and with the apostolic see, they like soldiers led by their general, went into the field with firm and confident hearts."

It deserves notice that in the issue whose chief points we have thus described the right of the pope as an independent authority, and as the channel of the Holy Ghost, has been rigidly preserved. Whatever steps were taken in the case they were taken merely as sources of information for the pope, while to him as to the judge, sitting in the highest court, was reserved the act of finally and authoritatively deciding the question. The pope has now spoken, and the matter is at an end. And it should be further observed that the pope has deliberated and decided on the issue, and after the manner, as determined by himself. Like Napoleon III, at Villafranca, he consulted no one. The laity were omitted. He asked the co-operation of no emperor. He convened no council. In his own cabinet he took all the preliminary steps. He called around him such ecclesiastical reporters as he pleased. With only a majority of the hierarchy on his side, and in opposition to church dignitaries in position very lofty, he, by his own proper act and with his own lips, settled an ancient dispute, and completed the deification of one acknowledged to be a creature of God.* An act of the kind is an assumption of power to which earth offers no parallel. The infallibility of the pope is not so much an inference as an implication, and the method pursued in the case paves and smooths the way for a magisterial decision of his own

* *Allocutio habita in Consistorio Secreto die 1X Dec., an. 1854.*

infallibility by the supreme pontiff himself. Nor do we see where these assumptions must come to a stop. He who is the mouthpiece of God may as well be the channel of his power. Omnipotence naturally follows infallibility. Indeed omnipotence is only omniscience in another form ; for he who knows all things can do all things, and universal knowledge is clearly a condition of infallibility. The career is begun which threatens to lead the papacy to the throne of supreme power on earth and in heaven, or to ——— speedy and irretrievable ruin. The real issue to be expected can not be questioned by any one who, living in Christ, knows of his own most certain knowledge that the poles are not wider asunder than are the physical holiness which forms the essence of the papacy, and the real holiness, the ethical or spiritual holiness, which forms the essence as of God and Christ, so of Christianity, and of the one true church which is its embodiment and representative.

The immaculate conception of Mary being declared an article of faith, Romanism bowed its head before the infallible authority, and rejoicings broke out on all sides as if society had passed into a new birth. Four years, however, have elapsed and things keep pretty much their old course. The apparent object of the seasonable determination has indeed been answered in the inflaming of the zeal of blind devotees, and in a slight increase of the number of converts made to catholicism ; but not the less does the pope owe his remaining in Rome to French bayonets ; not the less is he virtually a prisoner in his own palace ; not the less are his territories a prey to robbery, vice, and crime. Little reason then had he to employ on the occasion* these joyous words : “ No greater cause of

* *Allocutio habita in Consistorio secreto die I. Decembris 1854.*

rejoicing could happen to us in this life, since this decision conduces exceedingly to more and more increase, and foster here on earth the honour, worship, and veneration due to that most glorious Virgin, who, exalted above all the choirs of angels and ranks of saints, and most prevailing with him whom she bore, continually intercedes in heaven for the whole Christian family as the deprecator of evil." In England the new tenet was received with such temperate joy as attracted little if any attention beyond the pale of Romanism. Intensely Protestant and intensely busy Englishmen pay little attention to the rites of the papal church unless when its head affects to assume territorial functions, and bestow on his agents territorial designations. Hence the regrettable apathy regarding the ceaseless incomings of Roman influence into the land, and the silent though not considerable progress it is making. Did they see and know the system as it is, they would be more alive to the danger of its spreading, and more on the alert to withstand its secret and mysterious workings. For this acquaintance with Romanism, however, they must look not so much in England where it wears a mask, as in foreign lands where it allows its own features to be seen. For instance, we would have them study the following account of the proclamation of the new doctrine in the Sandwich Isles, on the 8th of December, 1856,* as reported by the bishop and apostolic vicar.

"At Honolulu preparations were made to give to the festival an air of solemnity. The church was whitewashed and painted afresh; a fine gilded statue, almost as large as life, representing the holy virgin holding the infant Jesus in her arms, was placed in a niche as on a throne; the

* *Annales de la Propag.* Vol. 30, p. 25, seq.

mats of the sanctuary were renewed; flowers were furnished for the altar; and each member procured a torch. The eighth of December comes. The representatives of the catholic nations raise their flags; the French corvette, *L'Embuscade*, bedecks herself with pennants; nearly six hundred of our neophytes approach the altar. At six o'clock the crew of the French vessel take their place in the church, and pontifical mass begins; it is sung by the young persons belonging to the schools. At the elevation of the host, on a given signal, a salute of twenty guns is heard, and the echoes of our mountains report at a distance that bursting expression of our faith, of our love, and of our hopes. In the afternoon the religious exercises succeeded each other almost without interruption. Toward the close of the day the interior of the church is illuminated; nearly six hundred wax candles burst into a flame: six chandeliers, supported by columns from ten to twelve feet high form six magnificent trees, the head of which is all resplendent with lights. The host is drawn forth from its tabernacle. To the praises of the God of love, hidden under the sacramental elements, are added the praises of his amiable mother. The eyes of the crowd turn with love toward the statue of Mary which appears so beautiful and so brilliant. They pray fervently, all hearts are moved, and each says with Saint Peter 'Lord, it is good for us to be here;' 'Lord, we are happy to find ourselves here in your holy presence, and under the eyes of her whom you have been so kind as to give us for mother. At the thought of the glorious prerogatives with which you have enriched her, our soul is in ravishment, and now, in performing this act of faith to the revealed dogma of her immaculate conception, our hilarity is at its height. In

honouring her we honour thee. For ever blessed then be thou, O divine Jesus ! for having made thyself known to us, and for having taught us that thy divine mother is also ours.' "

While the simple nations of Honolulu were thus idolatrised under the aid of whitewash, paint, new mats, wax candles, and booming guns, the less uncultured Romanists of England and other countries were offering worship of the same kind to " Mary conceived without sin," doubtless with as little reason in religion or the nature of things and less fervour. The idolatrous character of this homage may be seen in the following extracts made from a popular manual, intended for daily recital, and to feed " the fire of devotion toward the immaculate virgin already kindled in your breasts."*

Sing, O my lips, and joyfully proclaim†
 'The spotless Virgin's praise and glorious name.
 O Lady pure ! extend your gracious aid,
 Guard me from all my foes, O spotless maid,

* * * *

Hail mistress of the world ; & heaven's bright queen !
 Virgin of virgins hail ! thou star serene,
 O Lady hasten and thine arm extend,
 Guard us from sin and from our foes defend.
 Thee from eternity the world's great Lord
 Ordained the mother of his own pure word ;
 That sole-begotten Word by whom he made
 The earth and sea, and heaven's bright hosts arrayed.

* The breasts of the students of Maynooth College, to whom the work (" The Little Office, in honour of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary ") is dedicated.

† The original is in Latin, our quotations are from the authorised English version, and made *literatim* as well as *verbatim*.

Thee he adorned his spouse, and made thee free
From that foul stain of Adam's progeny.

O Lady, hear my prayer :
And let my cry come to you.

LET US PRAY.

Holy Mary, Queen of heaven, mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, and mistress of the world, who forsakes no one, and despises no one, look upon me mercifully with your pious eyes, and obtain for me of your beloved Son the pardon of all my sins, that as I now celebrate with devout affection your holy and immaculate conception, I may obtain hereafter the prize of eternal happiness by the grace of him whom you a Virgin brought forth, our Lord Jesus Christ, who with the Father and the Holy Ghost, lives and reigns one God in perfect trinity, world without end.—Amen.

O Lady, hear my prayer,
And let my cry come to you ;
Let us bless the Lord
Thanks be to God.

Such is the substance of the office, the rest being only so many changes rung on these thoughts. Criticism, whether on scriptural or other grounds, is in such a matter out of the question. Our end is sufficiently answered if we succeed in making this gross materialistic idolatry more widely known. Yet we cannot abstain from uttering the pain we feel in even reading these offensive minglings together in the same acts of worship, of God, the only living and true God, and God's creatures. The scandal appears in a yet more intense form in what follows, taken from

“THE LITANY OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF THE
GLORIOUS VIRGIN MARY.

“ Lord, have mercy on us. Christ, have mercy on us. Lord, have mercy on us. Christ hear us. Christ graciously hear us. God the Father, Source of all Sanctity, *have mercy on us*. God the Son, Incarnate Sanctity, *have mercy on us*. God the Holy Ghost, Spirit of Sanctity, *have mercy on us*. Most Sacred Trinity, *have mercy on us*. Immaculate holy Mary, *pray for us*. Immaculate Mother of God, Immaculate Virgin of Virgins, Immaculate in your Conception, Immaculate after Conception, Immaculate Daughter of the Father, Immaculate Mother of the Son, Immaculate Spouse of the Holy Ghost, Immaculate Seat of the Holy Trinity, Immaculate Image of the Divine Wisdom, Immaculate Ark of the Body of Christ, Immaculate Daughter of David, Immaculate Way which conducts to Jesus, Immaculate Virgin, who hast triumphed over Original Sin, Immaculate Virgin, who hast crushed the Serpent’s head, Immaculate Queen of Heaven and Earth ; Immaculate Gate of the Holy City, Immaculate Dispensatrix of Grace, Immaculate Spouse of St. Joseph, Immaculate Dawn of the Sun of Justice, Immaculate Star of the Sea, Immaculate Bulwark of the Church, Immaculate Rose among Thorns, Immaculate Olive of the Field, Immaculate Model of all Perfection, Immaculate Column of our Faith, Immaculate Ground of our Hope, after Christ ; Immaculate Ocean of Divine Love, Immaculate Beacon of Salvation, Immaculate Rule of the most perfect Obedience, Immaculate House of the purest Chastity, Immaculate Trumpet of Holy Poverty, Immaculate School of all Devotion, Immaculate Anchor of our Salvation, Immaculate Joy of Angels, Immaculate Crown of Patriarchs, Immaculate Light of Prophets, Immaculate Mistress of Apostles, Immaculate Strength of Martyrs, Immaculate Princess of Doctors, Immaculate

Virtue of Confessors, Immaculate Purity of Virgins, Immaculate Glory of all Saints, Immaculate Sanctity of all Christians, Immaculate Companion of Devout Souls, Immaculate Joy of those who trust in you, Immaculate Medicine of the Sick, Immaculate Advocate of Sinners, Immaculate Terror of Heretics, Immaculate Patroness of all Mankind,* *Pray for us.*

It is apart of the current idolatry to ascribe to Mary "a part of the merit in the work of salvation." "Mary," says M. Degenoude in his "Tableau Historique" "repaired the sin of Eve as our Lord repaired the sin of Adam." "O'Mary," exclaims l'abbe Guillou in his "Mois de

* The most recent addition to the honourable titles of "The Virgin" is that of *Generalissima*, or COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF given by the Austrian clergy, when at the beginning of the Italian War, they implored the aid of that mighty warrior against the French, who, though with a less prostrate devotion, adore "Mary" as well as themselves. "Mary," however, proved unable or unwilling to answer their petitions, and possibly, like other *fetiches* she may in consequence be in some way punished for the failure. The supposed interests of the Romish church are, in the opinion of at least continental Romanists, bound up with Austria, who, in the last concordat with Rome, showed herself slavishly submissive to the will of the Holy See. In consequence, the defeats which that despotic power has sustained in Italy will have called forth not only disappointment and grief but also vexation and resentment specially against the virgin Mary, under whose special protection the Austrian forces entered the field. Those defeats are in consequence a heavy blow and great discouragement as to Romanism in general, so in a peculiar way to the Jesuitic Mariolatry which now dominates the Catholic world. Some idea of the reaction against that gross and degrading superstition may be formed from the following anecdote, communicated to me by a gentleman holding a high office in the service of the United States of America :—"I saw the workings of Romanism when I lived in Venice, and the debasing influence it had on the lower and poorer classes. We had a very severe sirocco one night which smashed to atoms some half of the panes of glass in the city. My landlady said to me next morning that it was very mean and shabby of the virgin to take such an advantage as to send the sirocco when they were all asleep, for had she sent it by day one half of the damage might have been prevented. *It was a week before she was reconciled to the virgin.*"

Marie," we are your people, purchased by your griefs, by your tears, by your blood which flowed from the veins of Jesus." In "*le Rosaire de Mai*," you hear the angels deploring that there is no longer faith on earth, that God covers himself in darkness, withdraws his supporting hand, so that the earth falls when "Mary rushes from her throne, extends her arms and saves the world a second time," "Jesus," says l'abbé Oswald in his "*Mariologie Dogmatique*" "expiated original sin in general. Mary gave satisfaction for woman in particular, and repaired the excess of her sin. In the work of redemption she is the woman as Jesus is the man, and the work turns on those two names—Jesus, Mary. Mary is co-redemptrix of the sex which she represents." Hence, according to the same authority she intervenes in all the sacraments, in particular the Eucharist "in which there is a real co-presence of all her person—body and soul with a supplement of Marianic grace intended especially for women, so that in the mass the priest is Mary's minister for woman, while he is the minister of Jesus Christ for the faithful in general."*

We have intimated that various stimulants were applied in order to prepare the catholic mind for receiving the new dogma. To give particulars of these would require a volume. One must be taken as a specimen; the miraculous appearance of the virgin herself in the south of France. There is in the diocese of Grenoble about sixty miles distant from the city of Lyons, a mountain called La Salette. On this mountain "our blessed lady" on the 19th of September, 1846, appeared to Maximin and Melanie, a boy and a girl engaged in watching cattle. Both were totally ignorant. On a sudden they saw a light

* "*Marie at la Mariolatrie par Bungener*," p. 14.

of dazzling brightness, and soon after a lady in an attitude of grief, and with a countenance expressive of the most profound affliction. The two children started back with affright. But the lady bad them to come near and not be afraid. The children approached, and then the lady among other things said.

"If my people will not submit I shall be forced to let go the arm of my son. It is so heavy that I can no longer hold it back. Six days have I given you for labour, the seventh I (!) have kept for myself, and they will not give it me. Do you say your prayers well, my children?" "Scarcely at all, Madam," You mnst do so both night and morning. When you cannot do better say at least an "Our Father" and "Hail Mary." A few aged women are all that go to mass; the rest work on the Sunday in the summer; and in winter time when they know not what to do, the young men go to mass only to mock at religion."

Having said these and a few similar things "this beautiful lady arose a little from the ground, looking first towards heaven and then towards earth. Gardually she vanished from them, her head disappearing first, then her arms, and lastly her feet, till there remained but a brightness in the air which lasted a short time."*

This appearance was forthwith interpreted into an appearance of the virgin Mary, who, grieved by the sins of the

* "Manual of the Confraternity of the Salette by the Rev. John Wyse, catholic priest;" 1855, sanctioned by W. B. Ullathorne, "the bishop of Birmingham;" p. 3 seq. To prevent repetition we state that this manual is our authority for what immediately ensues in the text. If we may judge from the imprint, namely, "Birmingham Feast of St. Ignatius of Loyola, 1855," it is from the pen of one of the numerous unregistered Jesuits now so actively at work in the country.

world, and especially concerned at the decline of Romanism, was come to try whether her own personal appearing might not change men's hearts, and so enable her to induce Jesus to lay aside the thunderbolt of his wrath which he was on the point of hurling. The interpretation found acceptance. Among the rude and excitable minds of the rural populations of the south of France, the flame spread rapidly, especially as it was fed by the priest and the bishop of the district. Thence the passion went into and over other parts of France. From France it passed into England and most parts of the world. Forthwith streams of pilgrims began to visit the sacred mountain; miracles were performed there; and fraternities sprang up on all sides designed to foster the new superstition. The aid was too opportune not to be welcomed by the Roman Camarilla. Accordingly in 1852 the pope declared the high altar of the sanctuary of La Salette a privileged altar in perpetuity; granted permission to priests who go to La Salette "to say a votive mass of the Blessed Virgin;" granted sundry indulgencies to the members of the confraternity of La Salette; granted to ten missionaries of La Salette "the power to indulgence crosses, medals, and beads;" and, besides other favours, gave permission to solemnise publicly the apparition of La Salette each year on the 19th of September, the day of the anniversary, by the singing of solemn mass and vespers of the blessed virgin in all the churches of the diocese of Grenoble. The clergy are also authorised to celebrate the memory of the apparition by saying on that day the entire Office and Mass of "The patronage of the Blessed Virgin."

This "apparition" is at the present hour made to do its best in this country for two purposes; first, to extol

Mary, and so to intensify the idolatry which bears her name; and secondly, to direct the power thus gained for the conversion of England to Romanism. These are the main purposes that are sought in Mr. Wyse's popular manual, of which the title has been given. The two purposes its author has interwoven the one with the other so that they are not easily separated. The two, therefore, shall here receive illustration conjointly by a few quotations out of many passages deeply imprinted with the same character. We run the passages (literally cited) together in order to avoid repetitions and save space.

"It is for us, if we would follow in the steps of holy church (and who amongst us can dare to say that he will not?) never to cease but rather daily to increase our desire and means to honour Mary, whom the whole church honours, whom the saints and angels honour, and whom God himself delights to honour. There can be no respect or worship too high that we can give her, so long as it does not equal the supreme worship due to Almighty God alone. Let us never fear then to honour the mother of our God, always remembering that as in *this unfortunate country* her holy name is so much dishonoured, it is a duty with us to reverence her the more. As for *this poor country*, stained as it is with sins of the blackest dye, whose sons are for the most part out of the fold of Christ, is there no hope yet left for it? We may still trust that there is, if we but humble ourselves before God and implore the help of his holy mother. England was once called the dowry of the blessed virgin, and if we return to her gentle patronage she will look down toward us with loving eyes from that sacred mountain. From the recesses of that holy sanctuary the mother of God, who is also our mother, will ward off the

scourges that threaten, and save us from ruin spiritual and temporal. Some may fancy that England cannot be included in the reproach uttered by our blessed lady against sabbath-breakers. No error can be more fatal for Protestants. The Sunday is not observed in England; at least it is observed here less than anywhere else. The shops are shut, but it is not for prayer; the traffic has stopped on the highways, but it is only to open more wickedly the hearts of sin and shame. What a mocking of the Christian sabbath, to pretend the men observe it when they close their shops and houses but to indulge the more freely in blasphemies and impurities, the readier to court vices which in their very brutishness would have disgraced a pagan. This is the age *par excellence* of cursing and blasphemy. Has England no share in these sins? What are we to think of the insolent defiance with which the laws of God on mortification and self-denial, and the laws of the church on fasting and abstinence are systematically neglected and despised in this country? What horrible blasphemies are there not in daily utterance against the truths of Christ's holy religion? and blasphemies against the mother of Christ and his saints; blasphemies against the sacraments, the ~~vicar~~ vicar of Christ and all holy things; and worse than any, blasphemies against the sacred body of our Lord—for ever in the mouths of all, from the very lowest all along every grade in the community. Do not our Protestant members of Parliament, do not our nobles, our governors of colonies, the very chiefs of the state, when they take the oath against transubstantiation, call God to witness to a shocking impiety? Add to this the great number of evil associations, disunited among themselves yet leagued together by the one devilish object common to

all, of disseminating these blasphemies with an energy so atrocious that the very fiends in hell could hardly match it. See again how this crime of blasphemy has crept into the scientific literature of the day,—with what satanic craft and consummate ability the dark work is carried on in our leading books and journals. In other countries men blaspheme God it is true ; but then, at least it is done openly and without hypocrisy. In England only could men be found to set up “ chairs (pulpits) of pestilence ” as the scripture calls them, when, in the very act perhaps of invoking God’s holy name, they fling away with contempt every doctrine he preached and every truth he revealed. It is an awful sight before the eternal throne of God to behold a vast multitude led on by the devil and joining in a blind and passionate onslaught on the holiest of institutions and the sublimest mysteries of heaven. Can it be possible that Almighty God has looked on unmoved, and that consequently the reproaches of La Salette are not for us ? The question has but one answer in the heart of a Christian. The queen of heaven speaks to her children, and this land is without her fold ! The scourge of England is to come. The scene of her humbling has opened with the disgraceful exhibition in the Crimea, where, notwithstanding the valour and courage of her sons, she lies lower than she has done for centuries. Where will it end ? or has it perhaps been but the commencement of a just retribution ? Who can tell us ? who can lift for us the veil of the future ? Doubtless the welfare of England was once the favourite object of our lady’s prayers. What must have been its crimes when she thus turns from us in the hour of need ! Woe is to a people that casts dishonour on the mother of the Lord our God ! Will anyone now dare to say that we

have no need to practise expiations and atonements in this unfortunate country; that whilst infidels are railing at religion, and rabid fanatics are blaspheming around us, expiatory devotions are not the most wanted, and consequently the most acceptable to God in our time? and if by taking thought we should desire to make reparation to God for the sins of the world, and choose to this end the confraternity of our lady of reconciliation of La Salette, who can blame us for it? If Mary is again to have children in England why not cry without ceasing to a long-injured mother? The love of Mary for England was great, and much as this nation has sinned against her, she is ready to love again, and her love will forget all injuries and restore us to the birthright we had squandered away. Once more then England might have hope, if she would be converted and become a child of the mother of God. And let no one think this a matter of mere choice. France is listening to the warning voice of La Salette. Is there not warning enough for England in a silence more significant than words? Protestant England is the reeking hotbed of the pestiferous principles of the age. As far as religion is concerned we have, as Catholics, nothing in common with those around us. England is an unchristian country. We are engaged in a deadly contest which all thinking men allow to be verging to an issue. The fight is against the devil and his works. There is need for every available aid. To THIS END truly our blessed lady appeared at La Salette. Strong conviction as to the necessity of expiating the abominable sins by which God is daily outraged, particularly in England; an earnest faith in the mission and intercessory power of the blessed virgin, such are the dispositions proper for those who desire to be admitted into

the confraternity of our lady of reconciliation of La Salette. What hope in the future for poor old England? It is certain that increased devotion to the blessed virgin is a potent means toward obtaining all good; and whilst Almighty God is looking over hill and dale for the return of this nation, his long lost child to the house of its father, shall not this return be by the road of our lady? Let us never cease to pray then in the words of the ancient Sarum Gradual, 'Remember, O Mary, that England was once called thy dowry and thy empire.' The faith essential to salvation exists (in England) nowhere but among the few who belong to the Catholic church. All the rest are swallowed up in a tide of unbelief. Many, too, not content with ruining their own souls sell themselves in order to poison and destroy those of others. Hence the origin of bad and wicked societies of men who club together to slander and revile the church, that by instilling hatred to Catholicity into peoples' minds they may root out the last vestige of faith. Everyone knows how cruelly they succeed betimes by dint of propagating bad books, evil discourse and money, in perverting the children and taking away the fear of God from the parents. This is the cause of not a few of the murders and poisonings which take place every year; this is why so many commit suicide or become mad in this country compared with others; this accounts for the low and brutal behaviour of those of a certain class who in other lands are remarked for their gentle demeanour. What an awful thought! men on earth doing the work of the devil in hell! and yet so it is. Have we not need then of the help of our lady to hold back the arm of her divine son? We must never cease in truth to beseech her to pray for us poor sinners who have re-

course to her goodness. And we especially who have enrolled ourselves in the confraternity of La Salette we must pray earnestly for all sinners, and in particular for poor England, which was formerly the island of saints and the glory of Christendom, but where now the devil reigns supreme. *Good resolution*: I firmly resolve from this day forward, first, to propagate our holy faith to the utmost of my power how and where I can; secondly, to keep a most zealous guard upon my own faith. For this purpose I will never buy or read any of the vile tracts, books, or papers circulated by Protestants. I will also prevent others from reading them, particularly children whom I will endeavour to have sent to the Catholic schools. O Virgin Mary, immaculate and entirely pure, mother of God, queen of the universe, our own good lady, the only hope of our fathers, the joy of the saints, the destroyer of heresies, through thee we have been reconciled with our God, thou art the only advocate of sinners, and the safe harbour for those who are sailing on the sea of life; thou art the consolation of the world, the ransom of captives, the joy of the sick, the comfort of the afflicted, the refuge, the salvation of the whole world. O great princess, mother of God, cover us with the shelter of thy mercy and have pity upon us; we hope for assistance through thee alone, and we beseech thee to prevent thy beloved son who is irritated by our sins, from abandoning us to the power of the devil. To the shrine of Mary may all recur whose crosses are heavy and hard to bear. Are you sick? fly to Mary, for she is the health of the weak. Have you much to support by contradictions or the evil conduct of those about you? have recourse to Mary; with her you will find comfort and the gift of patience, for she is the most patient of mothers.

Are you poor and in misery? make one prayer to Mary, for she is the help of Christians. Mothers who grieve at their wilful children, wives who weep as they think of their faithless husbands, parents and friends of the absent ones whose safety is dear to their anxious hearts, priests for their flocks, all for each other, let us gather ourselves to the throne of Mary. By her intercession all heresies are put to flight, and by her prayers are obstinate heretics converted."

The appeal thus made may sometimes find answer and expression in "*The Litany of Intercession for England*,"* in which Mary is associated in worship with God and Christ, and together with them implored to labour for the conversion of England in the following terms:—

"Remember not, O Lord our offences, nor those of our parents; nor take revenge of our sins. Lord, have mercy on us. *Christ have mercy on us.* Lord have mercy on us. Jesus, receive our prayers. *Lord Jesus receive our petitions.* O God the Father, Creator of the world; O God the Son, Redeemer of Mankind; O God the Holy Ghost, Perfecter of the Elect; O Sacred Trinity, three Persons and one God; *Have mercy on England.* Holy Mary, Mother of God; Holy Mary, Queen of Angels, whose powerful intercession destroys all heresies; Holy Mary, Virgin of Virgins, whose eminent sanctity our Lord hath honoured with so many miracles; St. Peter, prince of the apostles, and supreme pastor of Christ's sheep; St. Alban, our first martyr, who, for the generous charity of harbouring a priest, was put to death; St. Thomas of Canterbury, who, as a faithful shepherd, laidst down thy life in defence of

* Published in "*The Garden of the Soul.*" Edition officially prepared for "the Catholics of this kingdom."

thy flock ; All ye holy martyrs of this nation, who voluntarily lost your lives here to find them in a joyful eternity ; St. Gregory, most vigilant bishop of the universal church, whose pious zeal sent missionaries from Rome for the conversion of our ancestors ; St. Augustin, peculiar apostle of this nation, by whom our forefathers were reclaimed from paganism and infidelity ; St. Bede, most venerable confessor, by whose religious life and learned writings the Catholic faith was eminently propagated amongst us ; All ye holy bishops and confessors, by whose wisdom and sanctity this island was once a flourishing seminary of religion ; St. Winefride, most admirable virgin, even in this unbelieving generation still miraculous : All ye holy saints of this nation, who amidst the innumerable joys of heaven, still retain a particular charity for the salvation of your country ; All ye holy saints of all places, who, though divided here in several regions, were yet united in the same faith, and now enjoy one common felicity : *Pray for England.* Be merciful, O Lord, *and spare us.* Be merciful, O Lord, *and hear us.* From the dangers most justly threatening our sins ; From the spirit of pride, rebellion, and apostasy ; From the spirit of hypocrisy, profaneness, and sacrilege ; From presuming on their own private opinions, and contemning the authority of thy church ; From schism, heresy, and all blindness of heart ; From gluttony, drunkenness, and the false liberty of an undisciplined life ; *Deliver England, O Lord.* We sinners, *beseech thee, hear us.* That it may please thee to hasten the conversion of this our miserable country, and re-unite it to the ancient faith and communion of thy church ; That it may please thee to enlighten the hearts of all schismatics who live out of the church, seriously to apprehend the

danger of their state, and the great importance and danger of eternal salvation ; *We beseech thee to hear us.*

LET US PRAY.

Almighty and everlasting God, whose judgments are righteous and counsels unsearchable ; who visitest the iniquities of the parents upon the children, to the third and fourth generation, and yet at length rememberest mercy : Forgive, we beseech thee, the sins of our forefathers, and turn away thy wrath from their posterity : Deliver the ignorant from being seduced by false teachers, and the learned from being abused by their passions, and the whole nation from the spirit of contradiction, licentiousness and discord ; that instead of so many divisions and changes in religion, under which they labour, they may be again restored to that unity of mind, steadiness of faith, and tranquillity of conscience, which is nowhere to be sought, but in the communion of thy church, nor possible to be found but by the conduct of thy grace.

O Eternal God, who, in this great deluge of heresy which overflows and almost covers the face of this land, has vouchsafedst to select a small number for thyself, and save them in thy holy ark from the common inundation : we praise and glorify thy infinite goodness, by which alone we enjoy the comfort of a firm and settled belief, free from the inconstancy of those who, having no support but their own fancies, float up and down awhile, and sink at last into the gulf of infidelity : make us sensible, O Lord, of these thy unspeakable blessings, that as we know thee by a sure faith, we may love thee with a perfect charity, and fixing all our hopes on the happiness of a future life, patiently suffer what thou permittest here, and still press

on to what thou promisest hereafter through Jesus Christ, our Lord and only Saviour.—*Amen.*”

The import and tendency of these extracts lie on the surface. A species of new religion has been introduced in the midst of Christianity. Marianism is established in the heart of Christendom. The new divinity eclipses the old. The son gives place to the mother. The father is almost lost from sight. The whole popular mind is absorbed by “the glories of Mary,” and to Mary the whole popular heart is turned. The externalities of Romanism have necessitated a fresh appeal to the senses and the charms of novelty. The appeal has been supported by the peculiar exigencies of a tottering edifice. Consequently out of her richly furnished pantheon Rome has brought forth a new object of worship, and is turning all her docile children to bow to the idol the knee of their adoration. With the zeal thus kindled she resumes her warfare against dissentients, and as if gathering up all her strength for a last blow, she directs her energies against English Protestantism. We await the result in calm confidence, assured that God and Christ, as made known in the New Testament and as operating in the real, the one true church, the church which is in human hearts, and of which the Saviour only is the head, will prove and is proving too strong for all the resources of error and corruption.

It may not be uninteresting briefly to trace the scriptural origin of the monstrous superstition designated as Mariolatry. The whole springs from an incorrect translation of the words employed in Isaiah VII, 14. These words were used in order to give King Ahaz an assurance that within a short space of time he should be delivered from foreign assailants. The sign is the birth of a child who, as

named "With-us-God," that is, *God appears as our deliverer*. The time is defined by the birth of a child just begotten. All this is clear. It is also in keeping with Hebrew prophetic teaching. The child was born, the sign was recognised, the assailants were discomfited, and so God's gracious promise was fulfilled.

For some five hundred years this not only was, but was acknowledged as the meaning of the scripture.

Some two centuries before Christ the Hebrew thought underwent a colouring borrowed from Greek learning. Either from ignorance or intention the Greek translators of the Old Testament converted the "young woman" of the Hebrew into a "virgin." The highest authorities pronounce their rendering incorrect. The Hebrew word in the text is not the Hebrew word which signifies a virgin in regard to sexual purity, but denotes rather a damsel as having the sexual passion and aptitude whether married or unmarried. This fact undermines the whole edifice of falsity and superstition now under notice. As early as the middle of the second century after Christ the mistranslation made in the Greek was pointed out by Hebrew critics. Justin Martyr does what he can to meet the objection, but he was ignorant of Hebrew; a knowledge of which would have helped him to the truth better than sophistical reasonings.

As soon as Christian apologists began to prove Christianity to the Jews from the books of the Old Testament they appealed to certain passages occurring in the Hebrew prophets. These passages (or some of them) had in process of time come to be regarded as first pointing to, and then predicting the Messiah. It is not impossible that it was under an impression of the kind that the

present time of Isaiah's Hebrew words was changed into the future of the Septuagint translators. However this may be, their future time made history into prediction. Accordingly Justin in his Dialogue with the Jew Trypho, (Chapters 71, 83, 84) urges the words of Isaiah in their Greek dress as a proof of the incarnation. Here then is a prediction to this effect "The Virgin *shall* conceive," &c. It is a prediction coming down some eight centuries from the lips of the great Hebrew prophet. And it is a prediction which declares the mother of Jesus a Virgin, and as such fit, according to the conceptions of the age, nor least of the Pagan mind.

"A Virgin shall conceive, a Virgin bear a son" (*Virgil*) to receive the impregnating influence of God's spirit, and so to become the channel of the divine incarnation. If, however, we may rely on the early apocryphal literature, the question arose as to how it was that Mary had conceived. Though about to be a mother she was still *a* Virgin was the allegation. Here we have the definite article changed into the indefinite. It now became a point of faith to maintain that Mary was *a* Virgin. In time it came to be acknowledged that she was *a* Virgin. The change from "*the* Virgin," to "*a* Virgin," was facilitated by the latin versions of the passage, for as the latin language has no article, so *Virgo* (Virgin), may mean *a* Virgin, or *the* Virgin. Mary then was *a* Virgin. Moreover as the mother of Jesus she was *the* Virgin foretold by Isaiah. The acknowledgment of this proposition gained for her the now usual and authoritative designation of *THE Virgin*. And thus the cycle of transference is completed. Having obtained the name, "the Virgin," tradition in a succession of dark ages, and with the aid of an ever-growing credulity, readily poured

into it all now found there, and all declared to be there by the reigning pope.

I subjoin the two passages of scripture, the misuse of which has thus led to this gross caricature of the gospel. I give the passages either in literal translations, or in the words of their authors. I give the passages arranged chronologically, as the facts thus presented show that it has taken something like 2500 years to induce the human mind to receive the dogma of "the Immaculate Conception."

OLD TESTAMENT—(Isaiah vii, 14).

THE HEBREW; (about 700 a. c.)—Behold! *the young woman is with child and beareth a son.*

THE SEPTUAGINT; (about 200 a. c.)—Behold! *the Virgin shall have in (her) womb, and shall bear a son.*

THE VULGATE; (about 300 A. D.)—Behold! *Virgin shall conceive and shall bear a son.*

THE RHEIMS; (1582, A. D.)—Behold! *a Virgin shall conceive and bear a son.*

LUTHER; (about 1540, A. D.)—Behold! *a Virgin is with child, and will bear a son.*

2. THE NEW TESTAMENT.—(Matthew i, 23.)

THE GREEK; (about 150 A. D.)—Behold! *the Virgin shall have in (her) womb, and shall bear a son.*

THE VULGATE; (about 300 A. D.)—Behold! *Virgin shall conceive and shall bear a son.*

WICLIF; (1380 A. D.)—Lo! *a Virgin shall have in (her) womb, and bear a son.*

TYNDALE; (1534 A. D.)—Behold! *a maid shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son.*

GENEVA; (1557 A. D.)—Behold! *that maid shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son.*

RHEIMS; (1852 A.D.)—Behold! *a* Virgin *shall* be with child and bring forth a son.

THE AUTHORISED; (1611 A. D.)—Behold! *a* Virgin *shall* be with child and shall bring forth a son.

The more marked steps of the change may be designated thus:—

1st Step; the Hebrew “The young Woman” is changed by the Septuagint into “the Virgin.”

2nd Step; the Hebrew “*is* with child,” is changed by the Septuagint into “*shall* have in (her) womb.”

3rd Step; the errors of the Septuagint are copied in the preface to Matthew’s gospel.

4th Step; the “The Virgin” of the Septuagint is made “a Virgin” in part by the influence of the Vulgate.

5th Step; the probable “a Virgin” of the Vulgate, is made certainly “a Virgin” by Wiclif.

6th Step; the “a Virgin” of Wiclif, remains “a Virgin” in Luther.

7th Step; the error is propagated from the Vulgate, Wiclif, Tyndale, and the Rheims version into the authorised translation.

One old version, and one only, recognises the force of the Hebrew article, namely the Genevan, which has “*that* Virgin.” All the rest follow the error originated by the Vulgate. The substitution of *a* for *the* before Virgin is of Romanist origin. The old translators here follow the leading of Rome. Equally do they follow the leading of Rome in substituting the word *Virgin* for the words *young woman*.

The leading sources of these renderings are indicated by the manner in which the Hebrew “*is* with child,” or *is* pregnant, is translated thus—

1 Hebrew.	2 Greek.	3 Latin.
“Is with child.”	“Has in (her) womb.”	“Shall conceive.”
Luther.	Greek of the New Test.	Rheims.

By uniting 2 and 3 Wiclif produced his "shall have in her womb." By uniting 1 and 3 Tyndale produced his "shall be with child." In this Tyndale is followed by the Genevan version, and King James's translators.

CHAPTER II.

SACRAMENTS AND WORSHIP.

SECTION I.—THE CONFESSIONAL—BAPTISM.

The externality of the Confessional has been made apparent. How thoroughly the whole system is external, however, can be known then only when the reader is acquainted with its forms and ceremonies. True religion, having its source in God, has its root and its growth in the heart of man. Such is the teaching of the Bible. So completely is this grand truth interwoven with sacred scripture that citations are superfluous. But Confessionalism is a system which makes religion stand in the infusion, through sacerdotal channels, of certain influences consequent not so much on "faith, hope, and charity" as adherence to an ecclesiastical community, and the observance of certain rites. That community is the church, those rites are the sacraments. The teachings of Rome on these points are set forth by her authorities to the following effect.

Let me premise that neither the space I have at my

disposal nor the object before me, makes it my duty to write a treatise on the sacraments of the Romish church. All I propose is to say what may be necessary to illustrate the workings of Romanism, especially in connection with the Confessional. Thus then does Rome teach her disciples touching the sacraments.

There is one and only one true church of Christ. The sole true church is the Roman catholic, consisting of a hierarchy appointed by divine ordination, and of a laity, or of clergy and laymen distinguished from each other by divine right. This church founded by Christ is anterior to all scripture. At the head of this church is the pope who, when authoritatively laying down the law in matters of faith and morals, is infallible, and his dogmatic decrees even antecedently to the consent of the church, are altogether irreformable. Out of this church there is no salvation, all who are in the church and conform to its ordinances are in a state of grace, and heirs of eternal life. Those ordinances are "the seven sacraments, or mysterious signs and instrumental causes of divine grace in our souls : — *Baptism* by way of a new birth, by which we are made children of God and washed from sin; *Confirmation* by which we receive the Holy Ghost by the imposition of the hands of the successors of the apostles (Acts, VIII) *the blessed eucharist* which feeds and nourishes souls with the body and blood of Christ, really present under the forms of bread and wine, or under either of them; *Penance* by which penitent sinners are absolved from their sins by virtue of the commission given by Christ to his ministers, (St. John XX, and St. Matt. XVIII.) *Extreme Unction* which wipes away the relics of sin, and arms the soul with the grace of God in the time of sickness, (St. James V.) *Holy Orders*

by which the ministers of God are consecrated; and *Matrimony* which as a sacred sign of the indissoluble union of Christ and his Church, unites the married couple in a holy band, and imparts a grace to them suitable to that state,*" (Ephs. V.)

The term sacrament is here defined. It may, however, be desirable on so important a point to cite the testimony of the eminent Jesuit Doctor, Perrone.

A sacrament is something open to the senses, which, by divine appointment, has the power both of declaring and producing sanctity and justification. There are seven sacraments, neither more nor less. These are baptism, confirmation, the mass, penance, extreme unction, the priesthood, and matrimony. Each one of these is truly and properly a sacrament, and they are all of divine institution. The Council of Trent expressly states this doctrine and confirms it with a curse. The sacraments have specially two effects, namely, to sanctify and to seal. All seven sanctify; baptism, confirmation and the priesthood seal as well as sanctify. The sacraments are not appointed merely for nourishing faith, but contain the grace which they signify, and by the mere act confer that grace on those who oppose no bar. The sacraments are, each severally and all collectively, necessary to salvation. Faith is not necessary in him who ministers the sacraments. A minister lying under the guilt of mortal sin really performs or confers a sacrament, provided he observes all things which are essential for performing or conferring the said sacrament. All that is required is that ministers, while they perform or confer the sacrament, intend to do what the church does.

It thus appears that the sacraments are the channels of

* The Garden of the Soul.

is to be taken literally and strictly. Apart from the sacraments the mercy of God is of no effect; alike nugatory is the death of Christ. As, however, no sacrament no salvation; so while you are in a state of sacramental grace you can by no possibility be lost.

Scarcely can it be necessary to show that the Romanist doctrine of the sacraments has no support in the Bible. The word is not found in the authorised English translation. For its origin we must go to the Romanist translation called the Vulgate. In his letter to the Ephesians (V.) the Apostle Paul comparing the moral union of man and woman in marriage to the spiritual union of Christ and the believer, declares the junction of a man and his wife, so that the two shall be one person, a great mystery, that is, real marriage has a deep spiritual significance, purpose and result. The Vulgate gives *sacramentum* for the word rendered "mystery" in English, and the Donay or Romanist version in English translates *sacramentum* by sacrament, thus—"this is a great sacrament." The word thus introduced into our language is in general applied only to the communion of the Lord's supper. The application is justified neither by a regard to good English nor sound doctrine. Papal in its origin the term sacrament should be used exclusively of the papal observances denominated sacraments. The word in pure Latin signifies a promise confirmed by sacred rites, and so an oath, specifically the oath which soldiers took to the Roman Emperor. The sanctity which hence accrued to the word gave aid to the Romanists in the fabrication of their superstitions regarding the sacraments. While, however, scripture is silent on the subject tradition gives but an uncer-

wont to appeal, vary more or less in the meaning they attach to the term, and as they make that meaning more or less comprehensive, justify its application to either fewer than seven formalities or to a larger number. Not till the Council of Trent was the matter settled, and then it was settled only by a decree and a curse—in the following words : “ A curse on every one who shall pretend that the number of the sacraments is above or below seven ; a curse on every one who shall declare that they were not all instituted by Jesus Christ.” Such a decision is discreditable to its authors, and may here be safely left to the condemnation it deserves.

From these general observations on the sacraments we pass to the consideration of the first, namely, Baptism :

Near and around the Confessional stand vessels containing water, into which now a common finger is dipped as a preliminary to making the sign of the cross on the forehead or the breast, and now a priestly hand is plunged in order to sprinkle with drops of infinite efficacy the chubby and innocent face of a new born babe. That font and that Confessional may have little connexion in the views of the uninitiated observer. In reality they are most closely united. The font is the pathway to the Confessional, only those who are in the church can enter the Confessional, and none are in the church but such as have been held over the font. You must first be sprinkled with holy water before you have access to the holy man who sits in the Confessional to make you as holy as himself.

Water is the chief purifying element of earth. Descending from the clouds it washes away all natural and artificial impurities. Springing from fountains or drawn from rivers

it is applied by the hand of man to cleanse his person, his abode, and his food. Viewed in its sources water acquired a sacred character, for to the simple apprehensions of primitive ages it seemed to come down from heaven, or to issue from the bosom of the earth as the special gift of some bounteous divinity. Invested with sanctity, water became a symbol of purity, not in corporeal matters only, but in spiritual. Accordingly water came to be employed in various lustral rites as a token of the purity of heart with which God ought to be worshipped, and as a sign of that acceptance with Him which ensued from purity of life. In process of time the true import of water vanished, and in its place there came the superstition that water possessed an inherent power to cleanse from the stains and the guilt of sin. The sign, the token, the symbol, were lost from sight, and the efficacy which was originally ascribed to moral purity, was attributed to the mere element of water itself. Thus a spiritual idea was superseded by a material form, and the baptism which denoted the duty of repentance and symbolised its natural results in a clean heart and a holy life, was regarded and set forth as in itself bestowing sanctity, newness of life, and eternal felicity. This renewal acquired its supreme efficacy and importance in the instance in which the stain which it washed out was foulest and deepest. That instance presents itself in the religious community in which is found a clear recognition of the foulness contracted and transmitted by original or birth sin. Every descendant of Adam—so teaches the Roman church—comes into the world a polluted and so a condemned creature. The defilement is in the nature and so is radical. For that defilement there is one and only one cleansing. “Wash and be clean,” is said by the

Romish priest in the sacrament of baptism. By no other voice than his can the spiritual leper be purified. As out of the church of Rome there is no salvation, so out of the church of Rome there is no baptism of regeneration. Full power to reverse the primal curse is, however, possessed by the pope, and a few drops of holy water convert a child of hell into a child of God.

These notions are in substance echoes and reproductions of pagan observances and superstitions. First, let it be observed that all the language found in the New Testament on the subject of Baptism receives satisfactory explanation on the acknowledgment of the symbolical qualities of water. John preached the baptism of repentance (Mark I, 4.) and showed that he used water as a sign of the obligation of a great moral change, in the exhortations to reform their lives, which he addressed to those who came to be immersed in the Jordan by his hands (Luke III, 7—14.) While preaching the baptism of water he pointed to Jesus the Christ as the great personage who would introduce the yet more significant symbol of baptism with fire, (16 Matt. III, 11.) the holy flame of God's own pure spirit which would burn up and destroy in the soul all its moral impurities. The spirit thus baptised unto the death of sin was saved from ruin "even as by fire," and under the vivifying power of the same Spirit would, phoenix like, rise from its ashes into a new and higher life (Col. II, 12). The renewal thus betokened, achieved by the indwelling power of the Holy Spirit working in Christ, is termed "the washing of regeneration," (Titus III, 5) inasmuch as baptism issued in that new birth of the soul of which it was the token and promise, and was the prefigurement of that salvation which consisted "not in the putting away of

the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God," and of which the sign and the seal was the resurrection of Jesus Christ (1 Pet. III, 21). Having this moral and spiritual significance as its ground and its aim, baptism, as practised by apostles, and observed in the primitive church, was preceded by the confession of sin to God, the avowal of Christ his son, and a promise of amendment of life; and, under the divine agencies furnished by the gospel, realised and secured the highest spiritual results; while, as the first step in the new and divine life, it led to that thorough and harmonious development of the higher faculties of man which is denominated salvation, a good which involves not only rescue from evil, and so from sin, the only proper evil, but also the blessedness of soul which beginning here is completed hereafter, and of which the source and the reward is union with Christ and God.

This is the import, the aim and tendency of true scriptural baptism. True scriptural baptism is a symbol of that regeneration of heart and life, the final issue of which is the renewal of man in the image of his Maker. It is, therefore, profoundly religious as it is purely spiritual. External in form it is internal in aim, working, and efficacy. Beginning in the water it works by the spirit, and from the spirit derives the efficacy of which the water is but the visible token. That spirit is the spirit of God as embodied and manifested in Christ, which here as ever works in and with man's spirit, not as by a passive, an inert, a dead thing, but a living power, endured with moral affections and appetencies, and gifted with a free self-determining and therefore responsible will.

Such is Christian baptism—a symbolic rite which,

founded on the thought uttered in an old Greek proverb,— ‘ Water washes away all the evils of men ’—indicates and indirectly promotes that purity of heart and sanctity of life which are the essence of all true religion. Regarded thus water enters as a token and element of purification in all the principal forms of religion, retaining its proper symbolic character more or less in the degree in which those forms are natural, simple and pure. The heat of oriental countries makes the use of water there not only a singular refreshment, but a prime necessity, and so due regard to cleanliness and comfort occasions a religious sanction to be added to its use. The Brahmin is bound to bathe every morning before he addresses himself to his devotions ; the father of a family must repeat the ceremony at noon, and a member of a religious order is required to bathe a third time in the evening. The usage, as now observed, has all the efficacy which superstition ascribes to baptism, for careful attention to its requirements has in itself a power to cleanse from every sin. This bathing comprises several acts found in the use of water by the Roman Catholic church—for the bather takes water into his mouth, throws water before him, sprinkles water on his head, and, finally, casts water toward earth and heaven, in order to destroy the demons of unfruitfulness who war against the gods. The taking of water into the mouth is the entrance to all religious ceremonies, without which the rest are of no value, just as the use of water in Romanism is the first of the seven sacraments, each of which is indispensable to salvation. The water of the Brahmin is, too, “ holy water,” for he baptises in the sacred Ganges. In the “ Memoirs of the Society of Calcutta ” it is recorded “ In India when a child is named the Brahmin, after in-

scribing the name on the forehead, plunges it three times in river-water, and then says with a loud voice, ‘O holy God, one, invisible and perfect, we present to thee this child, the offspring of a sacred tribe, anointed with incorruptible oil, and purified with water.’ Humboldt, speaking of the Mexicans, states: “The midwife invoking the god Ometeuctli, and the goddess Omecihual sprinkled water on the forehead and the breast of the newborn infant. After pronouncing different prayers, in which water was represented as the symbol of the soul’s purification, she gave the child its name, receiving it from children who had come for the purpose of giving the name.” Other particulars which are included in the baptismal uses made of water by Rome find their resemblances, if not their originals, in heathen customs both in the old and the new world, and in modern as well as ancient times. In one particular all these observances agree, namely, in ascribing to holy water an all-powerful efficacy for the obliteration of sin. What the real efficacy is, and whether the efficacy of Roman “holy water” exceeds that of the Hindoo, the Mexican, or that of the Egyptian, the Persian, the Parsee, we leave the reader to determine for himself.

Before we proceed to the uses of “holy water” in the Romish church we will attend to the way in which it is procured or made. I say ‘procured,’ for conformably to ancient superstitions Rome recognises a sort of sanctity in certain waters. As among the Egyptians the Nile was accounted sacred, so with the Romanists the water of the Jordan possesses religious qualities, and on that account is employed in the baptismal services of infants of royal or noble lineage. Influenced by a belief of the sanctity of the Jordan, especially that part of it near Jericho, where

Christ is held to have been baptised by John, thousands of persons come together at Easter from most civilised nations on earth to bathe in the holy stream. These pilgrims endure untold sufferings on their long and exhausting journey in the assurance that the waters of the river will wash away every blot, how dark soever, and secure their eternal salvation. Two circumstances make the performance of the vow, under which most have trodden many a weary league, specially dangerous. In early spring the water is deep, and the stream impetuous, so that several pilgrims commonly lose their lives. Then the Latin church and the Greek differ as to the precise spot, and the difference occasions strife and collision which often end in blows and blood. The water of the Jordan, however, is not so sacred as not to be improved by sacerdotal benedictions. In order to impart to it, and to water from other sources, the required virtues, the following method is pursued. The priest taking a portion of salt performs over it the rite of exorcism, designing thereby to expel the evil spirit. Then he recites a prayer. After this he takes water which he in the same way exorcises and prays over. This done, he mixes the two together, and makes over the mixture the sign of the cross three times, uttering a prayer which is held to secure these qualities, namely 1, that the water thus prepared has the power to drive away demons wherever it is shed ; 2, especially to cleanse houses of demons ; 3, to contribute to the healing of diseases ; 4, to procure the protection of heaven and the graces of the Holy Spirit. Among these spiritual gifts is cleansing from sin. Over a marble vase holding holy water, placed at the entrance of the abbey church of Saint Mesmin, near Orleans, in France, there stood the inscription, written in Greek, “ Wash away

baptism is declared to be the remission of original guilt and actual sin, committed before baptism, and the remission also of all temporal penalties.

The water which has been subjected to this process has changed its nature, and in virtue of the sacerdotal benediction is far purer and better than it was when it left its Creator's hands. The transmutation is celebrated by a Latin poet in these lines, composed, it may be thought, on the model of Ovid's *Matamorphoses*.

Sanctus in hunc caelo descendit Spiritus amnem,
Coelestique sacras fonte maritat aquas,
Concipit unda Deum sanctamque liquoribus almis
Edit ab aeterno semine progeniem.

“The Holy Spirit descends from heaven on this wave, and accomplishes a marriage between its waters and the celestial fount. The wave conceives God and from its nourishing bosom produces an offspring whose original is the everlasting seed.”

Thus made divine holy water is very precious. Every drop of it is very precious. Not the smallest particle therefore can be allowed to fall on the ground and mix with common water. In consequence whatever remains is carefully preserved.

The water which has been made holy, is applied to a variety of purposes. Such is its essential virtue that its presence chases away evil and secures the presence of good. It is a species of guardian angel. As the *Bosjesman* of Africa carries with him his *I'tichio* wherever he goes and feels secure in the presence of his visible divinity, so the Romanist has his lustral and protective water ever at hand that he may be kept safe from satan, and live under the

shadow of the Almighty's wings. Therefore the water is placed in the church porch that all who enter and leave may take their protector with them, as if the church of all other places were the place of danger. While the placing of holy water near and within the sacred precincts is a matter of law, the faithful are exhorted to keep holy water in their homes that they may ever have at hand a sure refuge and defence. Out of these views there naturally grew the rite of aspersion. The rite of aspersion consists in the sprinkling or casting of holy water over various objects. These objects are the altar, the sacred utensils, the walls of a new house, heathen temples when converted to Christian usages, &c. Human beings too are sprinkled or aspersed with holy water, and that both alive and dead. Thus holy water is sprinkled over a corpse, and along the path of the cemetery which leads to the church.

Aspersion plays an important part in what in the Roman ritual is called Reconciliation. Reconciliation takes place when a sacred spot has undergone profanation. To explain my meaning by an example: the cathedral of Canterbury was profaned by the murder in 1172 of Thomas Beckett. In consequence the floor was taken up by the priests, and all the decorations of the altar and other parts were stript off. For one whole year the church remained thus as it were in mourning, and its restoration was forbidden under the severe penalties of the interdict. At the end of that time it was reconciled with great pomp and circumstance. The bishop surrounded by a choir, chanting Psalms of grief and woe, aspersed or sprinkled with holy water, mixed with ashes and wine, the walls of the edifice within and without, with particular attention to the spot where the martyr fell. The ceremony over, the building was

once more a church. The holy water had effaced the stain of blood, and called back the sanctity of the altar.

The most solemn aspersion is that which takes place on the Sunday before the parochial celebration of mass, when the officials sprinkle the attendant worshippers, during the singing of various portions of the liturgy. An anecdote related by papal authorities designed to do honour to a favourite son of the church, indicates the pagan source whence aspersion came into the Romish church. Valentinian, captain of the holy-guard of the Emperor Julian, accompanying his apostate master into the Temple of Fortune, one of the priests of that goddess made the usual aspersion over the people with lustral water. A drop of that water having fallen on the robe of Valentinian, that officer who belonged to the church, struck the pagan official, and with his dagger cut out the part which had been tainted by that impure aspersion. Julian banished Valentinian in punishment for the injury done to the priest. Soon after the apostate having perished miserably, God gave the empire to Valentinian as a reward of the courage he had manifested in the conjuncture. The absurd story calls to mind a distich in which Ovid reproves the superstitious heathen of his day.

Ah! nimium faciles qui tristia crimina caedis

Tolli fluminea posse putatis aqua.

“Alas! too easily are ye seduced to believe that the guilt of murder can be blotted out by streams of holy water.”

From this gross credulity easy was the delusion which led the Romish church to encourage the belief that holy water possessed the virtue of discriminating between innocence and guilt, and between true doctrine and false. This fond notion, however, lay at the bottom of the employment

of what is termed "the ordeal of water." The ordeal was a species of practical trial in which, as was believed, God gave judgment on the accused. In the ordeal of water, water was used in two conditions, first when boiling, second when cold. When a suspected person was to be subject to the ordeal of boiling water he was first made to attend mass. Then the water was conjured by a priest who said "I conjure thee that if this person is innocent God may take him under his protection, but if he is guilty and yet dares to put his hand into thy fluid, then I pray the Almighty to declare against him that he may learn to fear the name of the Lord." Into a vessel filled with boiling water a ring or a stone is then cast. This ring or this stone the accused person is required to fish up. His right arm is laid bare. Not always willing to expose it in its whole length, the law determines whether it shall be plunged into the water up to the wrist, the elbow, or the shoulders, the difference depending on the gravity of the supposed transgression. If the arm comes out unhurt the accused is innocent, if injured, guilty. It is to be feared that the proof of innocence is rare when the test is scalding water.

In the application of the cold water ordeal the following was the usage: When the priest who performed mass had communicated, he turned to the accused, and conjured him (or her) by all that was sacred not to approach the altar if he knew himself to be guilty. Then he allowed him to eat the consecrated wafer, and while handing the host to him said aloud, "May the body of Jesus Christ be the touchstone of thy integrity." After being sprinkled with holy water, the accused was taken by other priests to the place where the ordeal was to be made. Then the

eldest of them conjured the water, and commanded it to leave him uninjured if guiltless, assuring him he had nothing to fear if such was his condition. Litanies having been chanted, the man was bound hand and foot and cast into a stream. If he sank he was pronounced innocent, if he floated he was pronounced guilty, and forthwith executed. This proof of guilt was founded on the belief that those who were possessed by the devil were made by him so light that they could not sink even when bound, or when, as was sometimes done, a stone was hung about their neck. This cold water ordeal, the existence of which can be traced back as early as the fifth century, is known to have been applied in the sixteenth in order to detect diabolical influence in the shape of witchcraft. Proceeding on the aforementioned supposition that satan, in order to foil the church, deprived his agents of specific gravity, the poor creatures, mostly old women who bore the repute of being witches, were thrown bandaged or weighted into a river. If they sank they were innocent and perished, if they were floated they were guilty, and, as such, received condign punishment. Such was the chance of escape from the cruelties of persecution then had by persons now universally admitted to have been accused without cause and punished without reason! Better off might they be who for any crime were adjudged to be drowned, for while heaven interposed to sink the witch in spite of the satanic aid she had, it stretched out its arm to save the criminal. The fancy is illustrated in a story told by Gregory of Tours. A woman who was charged with adultery was condemned to be thrown into a river. A large concourse of people assembled to witness her punishment. The condemned woman, with a stone tied round her neck and fol-

lowed by the curses of her husband, was thrown from a bridge ; but the rope by which the stone was fastened struck on a pale that was in the river : in consequence the woman was held above the water. At that sight the people cried “a miracle ! a miracle !” Accordingly the woman was relieved from her perilous position and set at liberty.

I have already intimated that material objects employed in the services of the church were sprinkled with water. I add that everything therewith connected is consecrated in some way or other. Without attempting to particularise in a case where the particulars are so numerous, I content myself with noticing the baptism of church bells. In the communion of Rome bells are employed not merely to call the faithful to worship, but on a variety of special occasions, as during processions whether in the aisles of a church or the streets of a city, also at the recital of certain portions of the service of mass, and specially when the host receives benediction from the lips of the officiating priest, and is elevated by his hands to be worshipped by the congregation. The virtues which are possessed by bells, when consecrated, may be learnt from the Roman ritual of consecration. According to this ritual the officials, when a bell is to be baptised, chant several Psalms. Then the pontiff pronounces a blessing on the water mixed with salt with which he is to wash or baptise the bell. During the act of baptism other Psalms are chanted. Afterwards the principal official anoints the outside of the bell with holy oil, repeating meanwhile a prayer, in which the Holy Spirit is intreated to sanctify this vessel in order that its sounds may inspire believers with hope and faith, drive away tempests and thunderstorms and put to flight the enemies of the cross, the figure of which is imprinted on the bell in

casting. Another Psalm is sung, during which the bell is anointed with holy oil seven times on the outside and four times on the inside. A long prayer accompanies these anointings. Then incense is kindled, and placed under the mouth of the bell, where it remains while again another Psalm is sung. Then follows a prayer, and a lesson from the New Testament.

Rites so solemn and prolonged naturally give in the minds of the people special sanctity to baptise bells. Hence superstitious notions scarcely surpassed in the grossest darkness of paganism. In the history of the sanguinary wars in Italy during the middle ages, a bell, fixed in a sort of car, was carried into battle. The car, a most sacred object, was guarded by a body of soldiers, decorated gorgeously, and drawn by bullocks richly caparisoned. Among the decorations were the flags of the diverse bodies of troops. This car was the centre of the force, and its rallying point. It was defended with bravery to which superstition lent an impulse, and the loss of it was accounted a great calamity and an almost irreparable disgrace. Romish writers tell many incredible tales of the wonderful virtues of baptised bells. There is (or was) in Arragon one called "the bell of miracles," which always rings of its own accord when something injurious to Christianity is on the point of taking place. King Clothaire having been charmed with the sound of the bell of Saint Stephen's church, of which Saint Wolf was the bishop, caused the bell to be removed to Paris for his own delectation. The removal greatly displeased the bishop. Some way or other the bishop and the bell came to an understanding. Accordingly when the bell was suspended in Paris it lost all that sweetness of tone by which the

monarch had been delighted. The King commanded the refractory bell to be restored. No sooner was the bell in its old place than it recovered its good humour, and sent its mellifluous notes to a distance of seven miles all round from the episcopal city. It would be easy to subjoin similar tales taken from Catholic works* of recent origin, and published expressly in order to promote the interests of the church.

From the baptism of bells we pass to the baptism of children. The Roman ritual of baptism is as follows:—The minister of the sacrament breathes on the infant three times in order to drive away the unclean spirit of the devil. Then he makes the sign of the cross on the child's forehead and breast. Thereupon he offers up a prayer. Next he places his hands on the child's head, accompanying the act with another prayer. The marking with the cross and the imposition of hands signify that the child now belongs to the church. Holy salt, the sign of wisdom and fidelity, is then put into the child's mouth. A third prayer. Then ensues a formal exorcism intended to expel satan from the child's forehead. A fourth prayer; after which the child is introduced into the church. The priest proceeding toward the baptismal font is followed by the child, and the godfather and godmother with whom he recites the Apostles creed and the Lord's prayer. Here a second exorcism takes place. This over, the priest touches with his own spittle the ears and the nostrils of the child in order to preserve the senses from the in-coming of evil. Next the child by his representatives, the godfather and godmother, renounces the devil and all his works. Finally the breast

* *Origines et Raison de la Liturgie Catholique* : published by the Abbe Migne, Paris, 1844, p. 373.

and the shoulders of the child are anointed with holy oil as indicative of his consecration to God.

A compendious form makes provision for cases of necessity. When the subject of the sacrament is in danger of death, or when there is not time for the performance of the rite in full, anointing is accounted a legitimate baptism. Baptism by one who is not a priest is performed in the following manner. The baptiser takes common water, and while pouring it on the head and face of the child, says 'I baptise thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.—Amen.'

The moral and spiritual effects of baptism are described in these stanzas :—

Hic gurgis est fideles	Here is the source which with its stream
------------------------	---

Purgans liquore mentes,	Purifies faithful souls,
Dum rore corpus sudat,	While the body inhales the dew
Peccata tergit unda.	The water cleanses sin away.

Tibi laus !	Glory to God !
-------------	----------------

Gaudete, candidati !	Rejoice, ye white-clad sons !
Electa vasa regni !	Chosen vessels of the king- dom of Christ !

In morte consepulti,	Buried with him in death,
Christi fide renati.	Ye are re-born in faith.

Tibi laus !	Glory to God !
-------------	----------------

Baptism having blotted out original sin and so rescued the baptised person from the power of satan, not only communicates righteousness but makes him a child of God. As such he has escaped the pains of hell and is an heir to the joys of heaven. Moreover he is become a member of the church. As a member of the church he belongs to the church, and is under the care of the church. Being

under the care of the church, the church is bound to care for him. Baptism, in consequence, is a permanent bond—overriding every other. If the parents belong to the church and are faithful to the church, they are the churches' instruments for the training of the child. If otherwise, the training of the child is the duty of the church, and the church is compelled to remove the child from the hands of its parents, and take it into its own hands. The removal may not be practicable when the civil power is not catholic, or where being catholic, it is infected with modern notions of an infidel tendency. But where the magistrate is a true son of the church his aid is to be invoked, and the baptised child is to be taken into the church's bosom. This duty is imperative in the degree in which the interests of time are surpassed by the interests of eternity. The church cannot permit any one who has been transferred from the kingdom of satan into the kingdom of God, to perish for ever. Perish for ever the baptised must and will if he is left to be brought up by infidels or heretics. It is a divine truth, and a clearly taught doctrine of the church that, as out of the church there is no salvation, so infants that die unbaptised pass into and suffer everlasting punishment.

The proper agent of the church in baptism is a priest. The priest may or may not be a virtuous man. It is of no consequence, for the validity of the sacrament is in no way affected by the character of the minister. The hand that sprinkles the water, and makes the sign of the cross, may be degraded by plunder, or be defiled with blood, nevertheless it is a consecrated hand, and so is fit and proper to bestow consecration. The channel is nothing, the stream which runs through it is every thing. Contrary to natural laws pure water remains pure though it passes down filthy

sewers. Not always, however, is the hand employed in baptism a consecrated hand. With unusual liberality Rome is content to be served by the professors of other faiths, or of no faith at all, nay, by her avowed opponents. In urgent cases any one may baptise a child. A Jew may baptise a child, a pagan, a heretic. The only provision is that the baptism be performed according to the intention of the church. This provision is general and vague. It may mean much, it may mean little. It may be assumed, imputed or denied, as the ever fluctuating interests and changing views of Rome may suggest or require. Accordingly in mixed populations, as where Catholics and Protestants, Catholics and Jews, Catholics and Pagans, live together, the children of Protestants, Jews and Pagans are never safe from the all-devouring zeal of Catholics, with whom it is a primary duty to save men's souls and increase the number of the faithful. Hence a Catholic servant in a Protestant family may be a missionary of Rome, and so be required by her confessor as a condition of her receiving absolution, to secretly baptise a child or children belonging to her employers. The duty thus imposed is urged on the servant by the strongest of motives, namely, her fear of hell and hope of heaven. A consideration so powerful pressed on an ignorant and superstitious girl, may well prove irresistible, and would even in England have inflicted terrible woe on family circles, but for the protecting arm of the civil power. In countries where the emissaries of Rome are unrestrained by the law, and especially where the law is on their side, they lose no opportunity to kidnap children in order to make them Catholics. Acting, however, on the principle that force is not to be used if it involves a loss of influence, and if the end may be attained by mil-

der measures, they employ persuasion and even cajolery, or any means which success may demand. The real character of a power is seen best then where it has free and full course. Among half-civilised heathen populations Rome can do almost as she pleases. I shall, therefore, ask how Rome acts in her foreign missions. What the baptism of the Confessional really is may be seen from the following reports made by sacerdotal agents of hers acting in China.

“In spite of the obstacles put in our way by the mandarins we have baptised 888 adults in the course of the year. God be praised! But it is our Angelical society that gives us the greatest comfort. The number of infidel children baptised, when in danger of death, goes on continually increasing; this year (1848) it amounts to 84,416; of whom about two-thirds, already in possession of unutterable felicity, will love and praise God eternally. The more aid we receive from Europe the more will this work extend its benefits. We have opened in several cities little shops where Christian physicians gratuitously distribute pills for sick children, and generously bestow their attention and skill on all the infants that are brought to them. This work produces marvellous effects, procures baptism for a great number of children, singularly pleases the heathen people, and has even obtained the commendations of several mandarins. These shops cost us a good deal of money. The more you give the more souls we shall save. To explain the prodigious success of our Angelical undertaking you must know that all China is covered with paupers, reduced to the last degree of wretchedness, and yet often burdened with a numerous family. These children are in want of everything—no food, no clothes, often no shelter. Their mothers die of hunger and cold, their infants whom they

suckle, expire with them. These supply an abundant harvest to our baptisers. The latter preferably seek for these poor wretches, address them kindly, testify a lively interest in their young family, give them pills, sometimes add a few alms ; when forthwith they are received as angels descended from heaven, and are readily allowed to baptise the dying children. Some of our physicians have effected astonishing cures, although they have little skill, and thus have acquired extraordinary reputation. Hippocrates was not so lauded. Here sponges are unknown. The idea occurred to us of importing sponges from Macao, as being more convenient than cotton for baptising. The pagans admire the sponges, and look on them as an infallible means of cure. They like to see the faces of their children washed with an instrument so marvellous. They laugh and expect a great deal. We hope that next year the number of baptised children will approach 100,000, by and bye it may reach 200,000 a year, if you send us a copious supply. No where else will your money achieve the salvation of so many souls. Besiege heaven then ; you will be heard. China, which contains 300,000,000 of inhabitants, once converted, you may compute the multitude of little Chinese who will every year ascend to heaven. You may be surprised in Europe that there should be so great a distribution of pills. But the Chinese are as much addicted to medicine as Europeans are to coffee. You may form some notion of this from these facts. The city of Tcheoung-kin is not large, yet it contains 2300 shops, in every one of which from ten to twelve servants are continually occupied in preparing medicine. You may call this empire an immense hospital. They swallow pills like sweetmeats.

(Signed) J. L. Perrocheau, Bishop.*

* *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, No. 129, p. p. 129, 130.

“In all the great cities of China there is an establishment destined to receive children who are deserted by their parents. For their support the bounty of the empress makes provision, but her benevolent purpose is largely defeated by Chinese cupidity. Entrusted to mercenary hands the bulk of the children die before they have reached maturity. Father Dubaury saw what an immense result he would obtain if he could introduce into the institution some one to baptise the children when in danger of death. With this view he sounded a mandarin, and the mandarin allowed a catechist to enter. Some pieces of money, adroitly bestowed, closed the mouth of those who might have told tales, and thus the good was done in the dark, without other witnesses than God and the angels. Every year they baptised as many as three hundred of these poor creatures, of whom a great number died shortly after they had received the sacrament of regeneration.*

(Signed) Guillemin, Apostolical Missionary.”

**Annales de la Propagation de la Foi* ; No. 133, p. 455.

Such is the religion of the Confessional when seen where it can show its own proper features. Words used by the last quoted priest in relation to China need only to have “the Catholics” substituted for “the Chinese” to convey a strictly accurate view of Romanism. “It is not that the Chinese,” says the Missionary, “have not also their religion, but what a religion ! Far from enlightening the people as to their duties, as to their present existence and their future destiny, it only binds them to the earth by ideas the lowest and the most ridiculous. It is possible that there are some fine sentences in their books, but it is not less true that these ideas have not yet descended to the people, and do not render their sages better.” Yes,

the disciples of the pope and the agents of the Propaganda doubtless have their religion, but what a religion! Far from enlightening the people as to their duties, and as to their present existence and their future destiny, it only binds them to an earthly power by ideas the lowest and the most ridiculous. For can any idea be lower than that infants, dying by hundreds and thousands, can by a few drops of water be transmuted into angels, and gifted with immortality? Can any idea be more ridiculous than baptismal sponges and salvation pills?

On a review we feel justified in declaring that Romanism is one vast heterogenous and repulsive system of gross materialism, a burlesque of religion, a vile caricature of the Gospel. Borrowing from the Bible body and form, and confessedly mingling Judaical observances with Christian figures of speech, and patching the old tattered garment with bits of gaudy colours and grotesque shapes taken at random from the world, it has galvanised the dead image with a heathen spirit, and now offers the monstrous birth as the religion of Him who was divine wisdom and power, as well as man's brother, friend and model. By its indiscriminate and senseless water-practise it has baptised the wainscot of the altar, the millinery of the priest, the pebbles of the pathway, and the metal of the bell, no less than the distorted features of the dying babe, and the cadaverous countenance of the defunct adult. Pretending to communicate holiness to mere stocks and stones, it has mangled the form and destroyed the substance of holiness, and making the issues of eternity depend on sprinkling and mumming, it empties religion of its reality, and strips from the future its sanctity and awe. Having converted the church into a druggist's shop, and endued rhubarb with

power to save the soul, it had better complete its system of materialistic agencies by establishing in each city of the world a high pressure engine whence the disciples of Loyola may pump the holy water of baptismal grace over the heretical populations, and so make converts, and people heaven by millions every hour.

The doctrine that the sacrament of baptism in and of itself brings salvation is the ground of the attempts one reads of from time to time made on the part of Romanists to baptise children not born in their church. Those attempts, when made in countries where the population consists of Protestants and Catholics, lead to invasions on parental feelings which cannot be too severely denounced. Not long since a Catholic maid servant living in the family of a Jew resident in Bologna, baptised an infant born in the house without the knowledge of its parents, the heads of the family, by name Mortara. To this stealthy and treacherous act she seems to have been impelled by priestly influence. In virtue of that baptism the infant became a Christian, that is, a Roman Catholic—such is the doctrine of the church. Years passed on and the unsuspecting parents learnt to love their child with all the tenderness natural to the Hebrew temperament. On a sudden the servant declares she has baptised the child. The civil authorities interfere. The child is torn from the arms of its own father and mother, and consigned to the custody of Romanists, that it may be brought up in their belief. The parents plead the ties and the calls of nature, demanding the restoration of their child. The claim is disregarded. The whole continent is moved at this outrage on the most sacred rights of humanity. Entreaties, demands, protests have been forwarded to Rome from many high and powerful

individuals and fraternities. All in vain. The pope either cannot or will not restore the child, and now, in the middle of the nineteenth century Christianity has to bear the reproach of child-stealing before the tribunal of the civilised world.

It may be well to state the exact ground on which the pontifical authorities refuse to restore the little Mortara. Baptism, that is sprinkling with water, done in the intention of the church, is valid and indelible even though the agent may not be of the priestly order. As valid and indelible the act makes the subject a member of the church. As a member of the church the baptised person enters into a state of everlasting privilege, and comes under papal authority. That privilege the papal authority must guard for the good of the child; that authority the papal powers must guard for their own good. Hence arises a solemn obligation, and the pope is bound by a regard to his duties and to the rights and responsibilities of the neophyte to continue and complete the process thus begun, by which a soul has been rescued from the hands of satan and made a citizen of the kingdom of God. This is the view which has prevailed in the case of the boy Mortara. It is no obsolete view. Prevailing for centuries it prevails still, and has just received the express sanction of the church of Rome, under circumstances powerful enough to make that court pause and consider. It is well known how influential are the great opulent capitalists who belong to the Jewish persuasion. Influential everywhere they are specially influential with needy sovereigns. No sovereigns were ever more needy than are the principal Catholic sovereigns of Europe at the present moment. Surely Austria and Rome will listen to money lenders; nor can

France afford to be deaf to their entreaties. Well ; one of them, Sir Moses Montefiore, went to Rome, deputed (22nd December, 1858) by the British Jews to employ his efforts to procure the restoration of Mortara. What was the result ? Failure. Cardinal Antonelli, the pope's political representative, declared that " it would be contrary to the law of the Holy See to allow it " (the child) " to return to its parents without that religious education to which it was entitled as a member of the Roman Catholic church." The matter thus " closed " will surely open the eyes of all the non-catholic world. What family is safe in countries where Romanism is in the ascendant ? Who, not being Catholic, will engage a Catholic servant ? Even where the law may have the will and the power to prevent this nefarious propagandism, what complications, what evils may be engendered in families by baptism clandestinely administered by the hands of Catholic menials ? I give one instance. Suppose a noble and opulent house whose only scion is a male child. That child is sprinkled by a maid servant shortly after its birth. It is now a Roman Catholic in spite of all its Protestant parents may do. As a Roman Catholic it has a right to a Roman Catholic education. With the aid of the guilty servant that education is communicated by a Jesuit through a governess placed by himself in the family for the purpose. Ere the boy has reached maturity its noble parents die. Reason for concealment is now at an end. The young nobleman avows his religious belief, and begins to manifest the zeal for Romanism, with which he has been carefully inoculated. The barony, with all its immunities and dependences, including the gift of several livings in the Protestant church of England, has passed into Catholic hands, and will in future be made to serve Catholic purposes.

Nor does the danger lie against aristocratic circles merely. The month of May in the present year (1859) witnessed the success of the legal authorities of the land in compelling the restoration to her father of Mary M'Donnell, after defeating repeated attempts to elude the power of the secular arm, made by a priest named W. W. Roberts, aided by his schoolmistress M'Carthy, by whom she had been kidnapped and secreted. Nor was it until Roberts was taken into custody that the child was given back. Jesuitism is actively at work in England, making converts by baptising children, that, having thus stamped on them Rome's broad-arrow, it may claim, and, if possible, keep them as its own. In the case of Mary M'Donnell the *Habeas Corpus* Act, vigorously administered by the judges, proved too efficacious for Romanist zealotism. But who knows what cases of child-stealing prove successful? It is only the more glaring breaches of the law that come into courts of justice; it is only persons able either by themselves or others to pay lawyers' fees and sustain a prosecution in all its changes and chances, that can appeal for justice to our legal tribunals, or carry their appeal to a final issue. One case like that of Mary M'Donnell, in which the abduction and concealment of a child were clearly proved against Romanism, in which the law was withstood to the utmost, and in which it was vindicated only in virtue of the fear of grievous penalties, gives reason to apprehend others wherein the unscrupulous dexterity of papistical zeal evades the public eye, and makes even domestic life insecure.

SECTION II.

THE CONFESSIOAL—ATTRITION AND CONTRITION.

Next in the order of the religious life of the confessional comes the sacrament of Penance. Penance comprises as its antecedents Baptism of which we have spoken, and attrition as well as contrition and confession, while for its immediate consequents it has penance in a narrower sense, or acts of what is called satisfaction; also absolution, and indulgences. The matter thus sketched out in due order leads to the consideration of 1 Attrition, 2 Contrition, 3 Confession, 4 Penance or Satisfaction, 5 Absolution, 6 Indulgences. These six topics involve much that concerns the actual working of Romanism, and must accordingly receive due attention. On the two first a few words will suffice. I may here add that the sacrament of confirmation by which the neophyte receives, as Rome teaches, the Holy Ghost, contains little that is dissimilar to the doctrine of Episcopal Protestantism, and will therefore be passed over in favour of matter bearing more directly on the illustration of the Confessional. As a necessary preliminary, something must be said explanatory of the Sacrament of Penance in general. The authority we follow, when no other is announced, is the Jesuit Professor, Perrone.

The Sacrament of Penance is that by which the benefits of the death of Christ are applied to those who are fallen after baptism. Penance may be regarded in two ways, either as it is a virtue, or as it is a sacrament. As far as it is a

virtue it is at all times necessary for reconciling man to God. Thus understood it may be defined as the supernatural virtue by which man is moved to the hatred of his sin, to a firm resolution to live a better life, and to self-punishment in compensation of the injury done to God by his sin. As far as it is a sacrament, penance is a sacrament instituted by the Lord Jesus Christ, by which sins committed after baptism are by the judicial absolution of a priest remitted to a person who is contrite and has confessed. Penance is truly and properly a sacrament of the gospel instituted by Christ to blot out sins committed after baptism. This is proved by three passages of scripture ; John xx. 21-23 ; Matt. xvi, 19 ; xviii. 18. The passages of scripture here referred to are Rome's general proof-texts, and as such are reserved for separate and formal consideration. Specific scriptural proofs are what we have a right to ask him. If we exercise our right, we shall put the request in vain. Passing to the antecedents of Penance, we ask Romanists to tell us what they mean thereby.

Contrition which penance involves is grief of heart and hatred of the sin committed, with a resolution of sinning no more. This grief, if conjoined with a confidence in the divine mercy and a determination to perform the other things which are required for the due reception of the sacrament of penance, prepares for the remission of sins. There is an imperfect contrition called attrition. Attrition springing from a consideration of the baseness of sin or from a fear of hell and punishment, is a gift of God and an impulse of the Holy spirit, not yet indwelling indeed, but merely moving, assisted by which the penitent prepares for himself a way to justification, and, although without the sacrament of penance in itself, it is not possible to lead

a sinner to justification, yet attrition disposes him to obtain the grace of God in the sacrament of penance.

According to this authoritative statement attrition and contrition claim consideration first. The two are but parts of one whole, and may be best taken together; and first of attrition.

The very word shows that we have to do with a human figment and not a divine truth. The word has a foreign as well as an unscriptural sound. The word, Latin in form, is in truth as little Latin as it is English. If Cicero were to be asked if he knew the word, he would answer "no, not as a religious term; *attrition* means only rubbing on or rubbing together." Thus is neither Latin nor English, the word is without a legitimate parent and a natural home. Who will own it? The Romish priest is answerable for the outcast. And what meaning has he put into those sounds? Attrition is a sort of initial and imperfect condition, arising either from thinking of the baseness of sin or the pains of hell. The signification of attrition and contrition, and the difference of their import, are illustrated in the following: which is an instruction given to the Confessor in preparing him for the duties of his office. "Begin by leading the penitent to perform an act of attrition, by saying, 'Ah! my son, where ought you to be now? In hell, alas! in fire, in despair; abandoned by the whole universe, abandoned by God even for ever. You repent then of having offended God on account of the he' which you have merited?' After this lead the penitent to an act of contrition. 'My son, what have you done? You have offended a God who is infinitely good, you have failed in respect to him, you have refused to obey him, you have despised his grace; and now since you have offended

a God who is goodness itself, repent with all your heart, and detest more than every other thing the outrages you have done to him.' "Attrition and Contrition are of no value apart from the will and act of the priest. Not until he has uttered his absolving words, is pardon conceded in the court of heaven. The truest and deepest penitence is of no avail without penance. You may feel the grief, the love, the faith of the sinful woman in the gospel who washed the feet of Jesus with her tears, and yet be an object of God's wrath and perish eternally, unless you confess to a fellow man called a priest, and receive absolution from his lips.

How truly in describing the priests of Judea did Christ describe the priests of Rome, "they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne and lay them on men's shoulders." (Matt. xxiii. 4.) And how appropriate as well as acceptable is his gracious invitation "come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest, take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for I am meek, and lowly in heart, and you shall find rest unto your souls; for my yoke is easy and my burden is light." (Matt. xi. 28-30.)

From what has been advanced it appears that penance has two significations—it signifies a whole and it signifies a part of that whole. The whole is the sacrament of penance, so called, the part is the punitive and remedial element in that sacrament. As a whole penance involves contrition no less than confession and absolution. As a part penance is contradistinguished from both. Accordingly penance may be viewed as excluding contrition. Practically penance does often exclude contrition. Thus excluding contrition when denoting a part, penance may

come to exclude contrition when denoting the whole. Combine this with that propensity of the mind to fix itself on the outward to the exclusion of the inward, and you will see how penance, considered as punishment, may usurp the place of penance, considered as a sacrament. If you set a penalty on the neglect of a duty, the payment of the penalty will be accounted the same as the performance of the duty. The substitution of an artificial for a natural obligation deals a blow at the essence of virtue. Moral obligations flow forth immediately from the will of God, and spring up in the deepest natural workings of the heart of men. Their voice it is that we ought to obey. Unless we obey their voice we have no real virtue; the root of religion is not in us. Mere institutional morality is superficial because superinduced; something put on by a foreign hand. The white-wash brush of churchwarden penuriousness has in our ancient Churches blotted out many a glorious picture, rich in the deep, varied and harmonised colourings of medieval art, leaving what may truly be called "a whited sepulchre" where once stood a gorgeous temple flashing with all the lights of heaven. Thus do sacerdotal impositions extinguish in man the brilliant sanctities of true religion. And thus has penance come to take the place of penitence.

Contrition, considered as heart-felt sorrow for sin, is a Christian duty, constantly required in the Bible, and constantly recognised in all branches of the true Church. The error of Romanism lies not in the enforcement of contrition, but in so enforcing it as to make it of small or no effect. The error is reprovèd by the fact that the Bible knows nothing of the adjuncts invented by Rome. Independently of attrition, of confession, of penance, of absolution, of in-

dulgences, the scripture, pronounces a blessing on the contrite :

“The Lord is nigh unto them that are of a broken heart,
And saveth such as be of a cóntrite spirit.”

1 Psalms xxxiv. 18.

SECTION III.

THE CONFSSIONAL—CONFESSION.

Confession is the second requisite in the sacrament of penance. Confession is the accusation of the sins which a person has committed after baptism, made to a legitimate priest with a view to obtain absolution. Wiclif was wrong when he declared that if a man was duly contrite all external confession is superfluous and useless. The sacramental confession of all and each of the mortal sins that have been committed after baptism is of divine origin and necessary to salvation.

Confession is an integral part of the one Catholic faith, without which there is no salvation. This is established by decrees put forth by the Council of Trent in these words:—“If any one denies that the sacrament of confession is of divine origin and necessary to salvation; or declares that the practice of secret confession made to the priest alone, such as has always been and still is observed by the Catholic church, is not of a nature to be instituted and commanded of Christ, but a human invention, let him be accursed.” “If any one declares that in the sacrament of penance for the remission of sins it is not by divine right

necessary to confess all and each of the mortal sins, remembered after due and diligent pre-meditation, even hidden sins, and sins which are contrary to the two last commandments of the decalogue, as well as the circumstances which affect and alter the character of sin, let him be accursed." "If any one declares that the confession of all sins, such as the Church observes, is impossible and a human tradition, to be abolished by religious men, let him be accursed." Besides the authority of the Church, confession is proved by scripture. Reference being made to the passages already cited, the argument may be put thus: It is evident from these words that priests are appointed by Christ judges with power to bind and to loose, to retain and to remit sin; but says the Council of Trent it is clear that priests cannot judge till they have heard the cause, nor can they be just in inflicting punishments, unless they are made acquainted with the misdeeds not only in general but in every particular by the confession of those by whom they have been committed. Since then Christ has instituted the spiritual tribunal of penitence, it must be confessed on the authority of scripture that sins cannot be remitted and retained apart from a previous confession of all deadly sins with the circumstances which change their nature. The same truth is established by the current of tradition. Moreover (James V. 16.) commands "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed."

We reserve the full consideration of Rome's appeal to scripture to that section which is expressly set apart for the purpose. Meanwhile we may remark that the argument we have just reported depends for its validity on two points, first the interpretation put on the metaphor of

binding and loosing, secondly on the authority of the Council of Trent. The authority of that Council may prevail with those who do not need it, that is those who are already Catholics. With others it is of no avail. The Council answers for the doctrine, but who or what answers for the Council? With most the recentness of its date robs it of all independent authority. Priests of the sixteenth century are certainly not unexceptionable witnesses of a faith proclaimed in the first. How insufficient then must they be to declare infallibly what that faith was.

The passage cited from the epistle of James might have some force did it run, "Confess your sins to a Romanist priest with a view to obtain absolution."

The character of the passages adduced suffices to show that Rome can cite from the Bible no positive injunction in favour of sacramental and auricular confession. We say, "sacramental and auricular" for so says Rome. Here is the sole question at issue: does the scriptures enjoin sacramental and auricular confession to a papal priest with a view to obtain from him absolution thereof? Certainly not. On the point the Bible is totally silent. More silent the Bible could not be if its writers knew nothing of the system, either as a whole or in its parts. Not only is the Bible silent, but by implication it denies and disallows the system, for directly or indirectly it commands us to confess our sins to God. How particular was Joshua to reserve to God the glory due to him of receiving the confession of sin, when, desirous of discovering the transgression of Achan, he said to that offender "My son, give, I pray thee, glory to the Lord God of Israel, and make confession unto him." (Josh. VII. 19. Comp. Second 2 Chron. XXX. 22.) And Ezra, "priest though he was,

directed the Israelites in his day to confess, not to himself, but to the Lord God of their fathers. (Ezra X. 2. Comp. Dan. IX. 4.) With what emphasis does David, labouring under a sense of sin, declare that to God he will make his confession—

I acknowledge my sin unto thee ;
And mine iniquity have I not hid,
I said—

I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord,
And thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin.

(Ps. XXXII. 5.)

So in the New Testament Christ represents the prodigal son, when now come to himself, as declaring “I will arise and go (not to the priest but) to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee.” (Luke XV. 18.)

In the nature of the case confession can be heard by no one save God, for God alone seeth in secret; consequently God alone knows whether or not a confession is made. Real confession is the sole confession, and real confession stands not in sounds uttered by the organs of speech, but in the sentiments of the soul which can be seen by no eye save the eye of Omniscience. The sound is but the sign. The confession is made by the hidden man of the heart, consequently confession can be made to no one but God. Besides, sin is disobedience to God. In consequence to God alone belongs the right of confession, as on man's part to God alone is it our duty to confess. A service so exclusively cut off and reserved for God can produce its appropriate fruit only when done to God, and so who but God can forgive sin? (Luke VII. 49.) Jehovah by the mouth of his prophet guards the prerogative as ex-

clusively his own, "I, even I am he, that blotteth out thy transgressions for my own sake, and will not remember thy sins." Is. XLIII. 25.) "For my own sake" is the statement not "for the sake of the priest," nor "on account of thy confession made to him." The question as to who could forgive sin came up in the presence of Jesus himself, and by the same supreme authority was it decided that the right belonged to God and to God's messiah, with an implied exclusion of all others. (Matt. IX. 6. Mark II. 7.) Indeed the general doctrine taught by Christ was that his father, and his father only, forgive sin. (Mark XI, 25, 26.) If his express command could prevail with men, all the disciples of Christ would literally obey the word of Jesus, and say "Our Father, forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors" (Matt. VI. 12.)

Any departure from scriptural teachings on so vital a point could not fail to be followed by injurious results. The greater the departure the greater the injury. Here, however, Rome's departure from the living God is very great. Deadly, therefore, is the influence of the Confessional, whose central doctrine and constant practise is confession to man, and confession to man as essential to pardon from God.

We have said that none but God can receive confession. That the office of the confessor is one of extreme difficulty is admitted by the highest Catholic authorities. The terms employed serve to show that confession is an impossible task.

"It is a saying of St. Gregory that the direction of souls in the way of salvation is the art of arts. St. Francis de Sales adds that the office of confessor is the most important and the most difficult of all; to it all the sciences

contribute, since the end of all the sciences is eternal salvation. It is the most difficult: for in the first place the office of confessor requires a knowledge of all the sciences, of all other arts and of all other employments; in the second place, a knowledge of morals embraces a crowd of divine things; in the third place, it, for the most part, consists of a multitude of positive laws which must be interpreted each in its true sense. Moreover, there is no one of those laws which does not present great difficulties on account of the numerous shades of the different cases which require different solutions. There are some who, thinking themselves distinguished theologians and literary men, disdain to read the moralists whom they contemptuously call *Casuists*. They say that the office of confessor demands only an acquaintance with the general principles of morality, and that thereby all particular cases can be decided. Who does not know that all particular cases have to be resolved according to principles? But the difficulty is to apply to particular cases the principles to which they belong. That cannot be done without a profound discussion of the principles on which the opposite judgments depend. Now this is what the moralists do—they have sought to know by what principles we must decide a multitude of particular cases. Besides by this time there are so many positive laws, so many bulls, so many decrees, with which it is impossible to be familiar, if you do not read the casuists by whom they are reported; and in this view modern theologians are certainly more useful than the ancient. It is indeed not rare to find eminent theologians as superficial in morality as they are profound in the speculative sciences. For morality is the most difficult of all the sciences, and there is no doctor, learned as he may

be, who does not daily find in it something new. Those confessors are strangely deceived who give themselves altogether up to the study of scholasticism, regarding the study of morality as almost lost time, and who in consequence know not how to distinguish one kind of leprosy from another—an error which will drag confessors and penitents at once into eternal ruin. Holiness, prudence, however necessary in a confessor, do not suffice. He must also have science. Without science, and minister of God, you expose your soul and the soul of your penitents to the evident danger of eternal damnation.”*

A task so difficult, if not absolutely impossible, must be attended with failures. A task so perilous is attended with fearful risks. The existence of failures, of numerous failures, is admitted by those who have personal experience. It would be easy to fill a volume with such admissions. A thousand volumes would not contain the failures which the priests of Rome have become aware of in the secrets of the Confessional. Some of these are of necessity made known in the manuals published to prepare the confessor for his work. Even confessors in actual practise have declared that “the greater number of confessions are either invalid or sacrilegious.”† It is mentioned in praise of the Canon Rossi that he succeeded in making a person sincerely confess all his sins, who had received extreme unction thirteen times, and who had always practised concealment in confession. But how was the Canon’s success ascertained? Enough, however, on so patent a mistake.

There is another side of that subject—a painful and repulsive side, yet one that must not be entirely passed over.

* Gaume, *Manuel des Confesseurs* p. 71 3.

† Gaume, *Manuel*, p. 108.

What is, and what does the Confessional, in its practical workings in society? A full answer to the question can be given only by those who mingle among the masses of the Roman communion. There you may find superstitions engendered by the Confessional which are dark and degrading,—an insult to common sense, an outrage on good feeling, a very serious injury to religion. Things of this nature do not readily pass into print; yet books are the only sources of my information. From reliable sources, from Catholic authorities, I borrow what ensues. Spread among the people are beliefs the most outrageous, and miracles are recounted and held for true, the prevalence of which would be incredible but that it is a simple and unquestionable fact. A dead person confesses a mortal sin which keeps him out of paradise. Three years after the battle of Nicopolis, in which the army of the Emperor Sigismund was defeated by the Turks, there was found on the field of battle a head sundered from the trunk, which opened its eyes and asked for a confessor. A Norman brigand who fasted every Friday and Saturday in honour of the Virgin, was killed and decapitated by his enemies on the summit of a mountain. No priest being at hand, his head rolled down into the valley, and as it rolled called aloud for a confessor. A Cistercian monk dying in the absence of a priest who usually confessed him, returned on purpose the following night in order to seek confession, without which he would have gone directly to hell. A canon of Notre-Dame in Paris who had been buried in the choir of the cathedral was night after night thrown out of his grave. This continued until he had found a confessor, who relieved him from a mortal sin under which he was unable to rest in consecrated ground. Sometimes we read

of a dead confessor who comes to assist his living penitent. Witness Saint Basil who, while being borne to the tomb, effaced the confession, and so forgave the sins, of a very guilty woman, which, having been written on paper, was deposited on his body. Witness St. John the Almoner who, having received a confession, gave absolution in writing, after his death, and rose from his tomb to furnish a paper in which the absolution was signed with his own hand. Instances are on record in which one person confessed the sins of and for another. Saint Liduine of Holland confessed the sins of a notorious villian, and received absolution in his name and on his behalf. The mother of Saint Peter, the Venerable, was admonished and punished for having confessed, besides her own sins, those of her defunct husband. Even saints are known to have confessed to images and relics. Confession grew into a habit, and with some became as necessary as their daily bread. One Abbe Longport is mentioned, who every day made a general confession. The blessed Andrew Avellino used to confess four or five times a day. These routine confessions were customary in convents and nunneries, and cases are known in which the Abbess usurped the right of absolving sins, though the church expressly forbids women to receive confessions.

The children of the church are specially exhorted and required to confess when they find themselves at the end of their earthly career. Aleuin has these words: "When a Christian feels that his last hour is come, let him before all things renew his confession with purity and trust; then let him distribute all that he possesses, and then let him pardon all who have acted ill toward him and be reconciled to them." The canons direct all sick persons to call in the priest without delay, in order to confess and so to receive

extreme unction. He who, by his own fault, dies without confessing is treated as one who does not belong to the church. In the blooming periods of Romanism soldiers prepared themselves for battle by confession. William of Malmsebury relates how the Normans spent the night which preceded the battle of Hastings in confessing their sins while the English waited the dawn of the day which was to be ever memorable for their defeat, in songs and revelry. In emergencies confession was administered to masses in order to save the time required for individuals to confess. Thus Adelbert, archbishop of Trevor, absolved (1150 A.D.) after a general confession, troops, who were about to seize a stronghold. A special mass was prepared and said for such soldiers as had lost the power of speech before a priest could come to their assistance.

The last confession forms to other confessions the same contrast that the sacrament of extreme unction forms to other acts of communion. In other words, as the viaticum is the last mass, so is this the last penance. The rule is, that every one whose recovery seems to be doubtful should arm himself against the terrors of death and judgment, as with extreme unction, so with repentance and confession. Accordingly Saint Gregory tells how a father of a family, on feeling his end approach, sent for a priest, and having, after seven days penance, been loosened from his sin, quitted this life in joy. A voice had disclosed to him a sin which remained unconfessed up to that hour; no sooner absolved by the priest than he was ready to depart in peace. Another person, a monk, lying near death, recovered his consciousness by a special grace, and confessed a sin of which he was admonished by a vision, and on which he had hitherto purposely kept profound silence. At the same

time he once more repeated in confession all his other sins. The next day he died, with a joyous countenance, in the presence of all his brethren. Saint Bernard obtained by prayer the favour that one of his relations who had lost the power of speech should recover it and so be able to utter his confession. The anonymous biographer of the Abbot Filibert relates the following: "When a certain monk was on the point of dying he lost his speech. The priest of the Lord went to him and began to entreat him that if he had any secret wrong-doing which he had not confessed he would let him know by a motion of the hand. A motion of the hand was made. Forthwith the man of God went into the church of Holy Mary and besought the Lord that he would give back speech to the sick man, so that the enemy of souls might not be able to drag his soul down into the gulf of hell on account of a concealed transgression. When the saint was rising from prayer he was informed by another brother that the sick man was able to speak, and wished to confess to him. The confession was made, the penance accepted, and a soul was saved for the Lord."*

In recognising the healing virtues of confession men proceeded on the principle that the illness was a consequence of sin, and not till sin, the cause of the illness, had been removed could the illness itself cease to exist. Accordingly the fourth Lateran Council commanded that physicians should before all advise the sick to procure spiritual help since then the bodily remedies would work more effectually.

Commentary on these superstitions would be superfluous as well as distressingly painful.

* Die Beichte von Heinrich Klee. p. 271, seq.

SECTION 4.

THE CONFESSIONAL—PENANCE.

Contrition and confession constitute the essence of the sacrament of penance, and contribute to the pardon of guilt, and of eternal punishment; it also conduces to the remission of that part of the temporal penalty which mostly remains after the sacrament, to be borne either in this life or in the next. But there is a satisfaction, due that is a compensation of the injury done to God by our sins. For in every great sin there is found as it were a two-fold quality,—first the guilt and the liability to eternal punishment, which is removed as soon as the man returns into favour with God;—secondly, the liability to temporal punishment which mostly remains after the pardoning of the criminality, and for the expiation of which men ought to pay to God alms, prayers, fasts and other pious acts, either as penalties undertaken of their own accord, or patiently endured when imposed by a priest, in order that according to the best of their ability they may compensate for the injury done to God by their sins and satisfy his justice. The whole punishment is not always remitted by God together with the guilt, but for the most part when eternal punishment has been done away with by the power of the keys, temporal punishment remains to be endured. The priests of the Lord therefore ought, under the guidance of his spirit and their own prudence, to enjoin suitable and salutary satisfactions (or punishments) according to the

quality of the criminal and the crimes, lest if they wink at sins and act too leniently with penitents by imposing slight penalties for serious misdeeds, they render themselves partakers in others' sins ; and let them keep before their eyes that the satisfaction they command be such as may not only guard the new life and heal the disorder, but be a punishment for past sins ; for the keys of the priesthood are not only given for loosing but for binding, as the ancient fathers believe and teach.*

Such is Rome's doctrine respecting penance considered in the light of an atoning satisfaction. The doctrine is confuted by all those passages of scripture which represent God as forgiving sin on contrition, for no other consideration than his own goodness, particularly as shewn forth in Jesus Christ. It will suffice to quote the words which Paul utters in his letter to the disciples of Ephesus, " God who is rich in mercy for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ (by grace ye are saved) and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus ; that in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus. For by grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God ; not of works, lest any man should boast." (II. 4. 9.)

How different a view of man's condition as a sinner in the sight of God does the apostle offer to that which is set forth by papal authorities. The latter appears in the opening words of this section. Let the reader peruse those words and then pass to the words of the New

* Perrone.

Testament. The comparison seems to us sufficient to induce any one to prefer the doctrine of Paul to the doctrine of Rome. In the former what tenderness to win and captivate the heart! In the latter what intricacies, what rigours, what exactions! The former sets the sinner free at once on the simple condition of loving trust (faith) in God as revealed in Christ. The latter keeps the sinner in bonds and under penalties through life and after death, for though you may escape the eternal pains of hell, hardly will you escape the punishments of purgatory, good Catholic though you may be. Indeed as it is said of criminals "Once in prison, always in prison" so may it be said of Romanists, "Once in the hands of the priest, always in the hands of the priest."

If the words just cited from the writings of Paul are not contradicted by other portions of scripture the papal doctrine of satisfaction can have no support in the Bible. Such a contradiction is inconceivable, nor does it exist. What then does Rome make no appeal to scripture on the point? Rome here does two things;—first, she makes the scriptures she needs, and then she appeals to the scripture she has made. The fact that Rome makes her own scripture becomes apparent by a comparison of—

The Protestant Bible and The Catholic Bible.

John preached, saying,
Repent. (Matt. III. 2.)

Jesus began to preach and
to say

Repent for the kingdom of
heaven is at hand. (Matt.
IV. 17.)

John preaching *Do penance*

Jesus began to preach
and to say

Do penance for the king-
dom of heaven is at hand.

Woe unto thee, Chorazdin !
 woe unto thee, Bethsaida, for if
 the mighty works which were
 done in you, had been done
 in Tyre and Sidon *they would*
have repented long ago. (Matt.
 XI. 21.)

The men of Nineveh shall
 condemn this generation
 because *they repented*. (Matt.
 XII. 41.)

Joy shall be in heaven
 over one sinner that *repent-*
eth. (Luke XV. 7.)

Except ye *repent*, ye shall
 all perish. (Luke XIII. 5.)

The twelve went out and
 preached, that men should
repent. (Mark VI. 12.)

I, (Paul,) preached that
 men should *repent*. (Acts
 XXVI. 20.)

Woe to thee, Corozain, woe
 to thee, Bethsaida, for if in
 Tyre and Sidon the mighty
 works had been done, that
 have been done in you, *they*
would long ago have done
penance.

The men of Nineveh shall
 condemn this generation,
 because *they did penance*.

There shall be joy in
 heaven upon one sinner that
doth penance.

Unless you *do penance*,
 you shall all perish.

The twelve going forth
 preached that men should
do penance.

I, (Paul,) preached that
 men should *do penance*.

By substituting *penance* for *repentance*, and *do penance* for
repent, Rome has brought over to her side the great
 authorities of the New Testament. Accordingly—

John the Baptist preaches penance,

Jesus, the Christ, preaches penance,

The Apostles preach penance,

Paul preaches penance,

The Angels preach penance,

The Ninevites preach penance,

and while the obligation of penance is thus made to appear
 the great theme of the Bible, Jesus is represented as ex-
 pressly declaring to the men of every generation, ‘Except
 ye *do penance* ye shall all likewise perish.’

Amid the gross corruptions of Rome none grosser than
 this ; nor can a more open falsity be palmed upon a too

credulous world. Mark that the phrase is ‘Do penance.’ ‘To do,’ with every Englishman, denotes some external act; hence ‘to do penance’ denotes in his mind to perform something, whatever that something may be: something outward, something contrasted with thinking and feeling—it may be to recite a prayer, to wear a hair shirt, to whip yourself till the blood flows, or to make restitution, or to go on a pilgrimage. In consequence doing is sundered from being. To do penance is made distinct from being penitent. And this distinction is so marked that while, if you repent you are sure to perish, if you do penance you are equally sure to be saved. This is the open falsity to which I referred; but now I so term it because it gives the lie to Christ. Christ says “Repent, and you shall be saved;” Rome says, “Repent, and you shall be damned, for the only way of salvation is to ‘do penance.’” It may however be pleaded that Rome’s translation is more correct than that of our authorised version. In truth, however, Rome’s translation is no translation, being merely its Latin version done into bad English. The proper rendering of that version (*poenitentiam agite*) is *repent*. The Latin word *poenitentia* signifies sorrow and regret, and *poenitentiam agere*, the phrase used in the Roman Latin Bible, means to be sorry for. It is a state of mind that the phrase devotes. Doubtless states of mind lead to eternal acts. But here the outward is not presented. It is the inward that is marked and denoted. Most important is the fact for in religion the state of mind is almost every thing, while superstition is constantly making the outward the centre and the pivot of human existence, and this is exactly what Romanism has now done; it has inverted the gospel; Jesus makes a certain state of mind the essence of religion, Romanism

make a certain act the essence of religion. Jesus says 'be penitent', Rome, 'do penance'. In this difference lies the distinguishing characteristic of Christ and the Pope.

The transmutation of *poenitentia* as denoting sorrow into *poenitentia* as denoting penalty took place in the long and thick darkness which intervened between the third and the fifteenth century. This was the period when Romanism grew to be what it was at the time it was assailed by Luther. During this period the mind of the world was in the hands of the ignorant and superstitious priests of Rome. As ignorant and superstitious they gave birth to a religion of forms and ceremonies. Hence they substituted a ritual for vital godliness, and of course made the doing of penance take the place of regeneration of heart. Accordingly they denuded the Latin *poenitentia* of its proper meaning of sorrow, and reducing it to the form of *penance*, ticketed it as meaning something required and enjoined by themselves. By degrees the word lost nearly all spiritual significance, and came to denote either what is called a sacrament or an outer observance. This is the view presented of the word in a Catholic church dictionary, published by authority at Rome in 1644*. How is the word defined in this work? As signifying first "the sacrament appointed by the Lord Jesus Christ;" second "the satisfaction which a confessor prescribes to a penitent;" third "self mortification." No other meaning is given. Yet the import of the word, as thus explained, leaves out altogether the essential signification of the Latin *poenitentia* which, as I have said, is *sorrow* and regret. In this dictionary nothing is said of either attrition or contrition, and the mind of the reader is fixed solely on

*Hierolexion auctor. D. Macro et C. ejus Fratres; Romae 1677.

institutional practices—a sacrament, a satisfaction, self-mortification. How evident does the essential externality of Romanism appear in this fact. It is the function of Rome to take the very heart out of the Christian religion—a function which she has performed but too effectually.

The externality of Rome was the evil which Luther and the reformers chiefly deplored and strove to remedy. This most worthy object was, they knew impossible, while *penance* stood for *repentance* in the Bible. Accordingly Wiclif's "do ye penance" was disallowed by Tyndale, and from his day down to the present Protestant versions read "*Repent*." Cranmer's version studies emphasis, "Repent of the life that is past," intending to turn men away from the idle observances of penance to the momentous duty of purifying the heart. The emphasis intended by Cranmer is found in the sacred original. The Greek (*metanoia*) denotes a change of mind for the better, tending to a corresponding change of conduct. Such is the import of the Greek, and such is the import of our English *repentance* and *to repent*. The proper meaning of both the Greek and the English comes into view in the Apocalypse II, 2 seq., in words addressed to the church of Ephesus "I know thy works and thy labour and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil; nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love; remember therefore whence thou art fallen and *repent* and do the first works." A more distinct instance may perhaps be found in Matthew XXI. 28, when our Lord speaks of the two sons, one of whom on being told to go into his father's vineyard answered "I will not, but afterwards he repented and went." The same charge is described by Jesus in his wonderfully

instructive parable of the prodigal son, particularly in these words, "when he came to himself, he said, I will arise and go to my father and will say unto him, father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son, make me as one of thy hired servants; and he arose and went to his father." (Luke XV. 17 seq.) This is repentance, the only repentance known to the Bible—would it were the only repentance known to the world. Certainly it is the only repentance that avails with God and can benefit man. Turn from this grand spiritual reality to the sacerdotal sham which has gone so far to usurp its place. What a contrast! what a painful contrast! It is true indeed that Rome, though she declares herself "irreformable," has in a measure been reformed, and in her reformed condition gives some attention to the spiritual life which is the source of all outer excellence. The attention is, I would hope, not wholly without effect. I doubt not that many good priests labour earnestly and devotedly to kindle and feed the flame of religion in the souls of members of their flock. But, those worthy men have the misfortune to labour against a system—a system most adverse to true vital piety. They have also to labour against the crass ignorance and doltish sensualisms of most of those to whom they minister; who are all but totally blind, deaf, and dumb to the spiritualities of religion, and as such, sure to fasten on externalities and make them their idols. Hence the penance of the church kills the repentance of the scriptures, and a superstition if not a *feticism* is substituted for the gospel.

This penance, which thus usurps the place of penitence, is that part of the sacrament of penance which the church denominates satisfaction; and this satisfaction is defined

by the Catholic authorities as the compensation made by the sinner for the injury he has done to God by his sins. The general doctrine is that while attrition and contrition conduce to the remission of the eternal penalty of sin, and serve in a measure to the remission of the temporal penalty yet the temporal penalty for the most part remains after the sacrament of penance, and has to be undergone either in this life or the life to come. Penance then is that pain or penalty which the sinner, under the direction of the confessor, pays to God in atonement of his guilt. Penance accordingly is punishment, expiatory punishment, punishment the aim of which is not so much the good of the sinner as the satisfaction of God. Hence it is called satisfaction.

Here, then, we find ourselves thrown back into the ethical mistakes of the penal codes of barbarous times. In those times monarchs are injured and offended by breaches of the law. This injury and this offence must be satisfied. How can they be satisfied without suffering on the part of the offender? Suffer then he must, and suffer he does. Law thus becomes vindictiveness. Law demands vengeance; it pursues the guilty until its wrath is satiated. Has it not an injury to avenge? An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, blood for blood it will have. The offender is contrite, he has repented, he has made restitution, he has entreated pardon, and by these acts he is saved from some penalties, but he is not free, for he has not made satisfaction, and still must he therefore do penance.

Now I say that a system like this needs only to be known in order to be repudiated. Retributory and vindictive punishment is now avowed nowhere but in the Roman church. To inflict pain for pain is only to double pain.

And then the reason alleged is a mere figure of speech. The sinner has done an injury to God, for which injury he must make satisfaction. Why! what injury can the puny hand of man inflict on the eternal Creator? O miserable, the lot of man as set forth in popular systems of theology. A poor, weak, sinning creature, made weaker and more sickly than he would have been by the crime of an ancestor, is required to fulfil the demands of perfect righteousness, and when he fails, as fail he must, the little good he wishes or does is disallowed, and all the evil which, in his diseased condition, is unavoidable, is set down against him in the everlasting ledger. Once there it is all but irremovable. Christ pays the debt,—yet the debt remains. The saints contribute from the fund of their merits,—yet the debt is not cancelled. The penitent undergoes both attrition and contrition; he confesses and receives absolution,—still he has to satisfy his creditor—for he must do penance.

This heartless and pitiless theory is modified in practice. Confessors are instructed to employ penance so that it may prove not only a punishment but a remedy. The efficaciousness of that remedy cannot, however, be great since it proceeds on a false idea, namely, that men are to be won to goodness by inflictions, and inflictions to a great extent of an external kind. Inflictions coming immediately from a human hand may harden, may pervert, may even brutalise; but rarely, if ever, do they soften, revive, renew, reform. Only God in his providence can employ punishment with certain moral advantage. The reason may be that God never employs punishment as simply punishment. With God punishment comes from infinite wisdom and infinite goodness, and when it does not recover, it is not because

he is angry, but because we are perverse. That perversity you may make as hard as granite by pains and penalties ; but if you want to melt it, you must employ the solvents of gentle pity, and generous sympathy, and long forbearance, and all-subduing love. How far the requirements and observances of penance comprise those divine and mighty agencies the reader may be able to judge if I translate from Catholic authorities a few of the principal directions given to confessors for their guidance.

“ The acts prescribed by the confessor as penance must be penal, for, according to the Council of Trent, penance must be not only remedial and conservative but expiatory. These penal acts or works are of three classes : 1st, fasting ; 2nd, almsgiving ; 3rd, prayer. Under the name of fasting all kinds of bodily mortifications are understood. By prayers are meant confessions, communions, visits to the altar, and all the internal acts of charity, contrition, and acknowledgment of God’s presence. Every good action is regarded as penal, for, having lost original righteousness, we are all inclined to evil and friendly to vice. In practise it is the rule to impose acts of mortification for sins of the senses, almsgiving for sins of avarice, and prayers for blasphemies. The frequenting of the sacraments, mental prayer, almsgiving, are useful penances ; nevertheless, in practise, they prove hurtful to him who is not at all or but little used thereto. The penances useful to all in general are, for example, to enter some religious society, to perform every night, at least for some time, an act of contrition, to renew your resolutions every morning, saying with Saint Phillippe de Neri, ‘ Lord, keep me this day that I may not betray thee.’ A daily visit to the altar and to the holy Virgin to ask for perseverance ; the

Chaplet and three *Ave Marias*, morning and night, in honour of the holy Virgin, adding, 'My good mother, aid me to day that I may not offend God;' to say in lying down in bed, 'I ought now to be in the fire of hell,' or 'One day or other I must die, and perhaps on this bed,' are useful requirements. Those who can read may be required to read some pious passage every day. If the penitent has committed a great number of mortal sins require him to recite the third part of the Rosary during a week or a fortnight. If he is habituated to such sins extend the time to two or three months. Thereby it will often happen that the penitent will form the habit of reciting the sacred Rosary every day and will never fail during his whole life to the great advantage of his soul. To repeat morning and evening three *Ave Marias* in honour of the immaculate conception of the holy^a Virgin with an act of contrition; and to accompany them in the morning with a very firm resolution not to sin during the day; the repetition to be made on the knees or in an uncomfortable posture, is a salutary penance which may be given to all without exception. Another is to hear this or that number of masses. Also to recite every day during a certain time five *Paters* and *Aves* in honour of the five wounds of our Lord, delaying at each wound to reflect on the suffering of the Saviour; also to visit a certain number of times a church to which the penitent has a particular attachment; also to read, if he can, a religious book for some length of time. These penances may be imposed on all. There are others which suit special cases. A priest may be ordered to meditate certain days during half an hour; he who is in good health, to fast every Saturday for some time; the head of a family, to cause the Chaplet to be re-

cited by his family every evening; a drunkard, to go without wine for a time, or to drink it tempered with water; ignorant persons, to recite certain *Paters* and *Aves* on a tomb, reflecting that they will soon die." These penances are meant to be punishments and remedies. I presume that in the Roman Catholic point of view they are also duties. The effect then of their imposition is to make duties punishments. But punishments are universally disliked: in consequence duties must be universally disliked. There is no one thing, not the most pleasant nor the most holy, which you may not make a pain by making it a punishment. The effect of penance is to convert a life which God intended to be a life of pleasure into a life of pain, by converting duties into punishments.

The evil is mitigated by the lightness of the infliction. A few minutes suffice for repeating the whole of the ordinary penitential literature,—the seven penitential psalms, the Lord's prayer, the *Ave Maria*, and whatever else. It costs not either much time or much trouble. It is a sort of punishment made easy. Take two examples, extracted from directions given to confessors for their guidance.*

"A young man comes before you who is beginning to be fond of gambling. Induce him to mortify his rising passion by abstaining from gambling on communion days, or on Friday in honour of the passion of our Lord, or at least to be moderate in the time he so spends, in the money he lays out, in the number of his companions. After the same manner tell that young female, in order to conquer her vanity, not to put on all those ornaments of hers, and sometimes in honour of the Virgin to wear the least showy and the least rich thing she has."

* Gaume, Manuel des confesseurs.

Certainly gambling and the love of finery are let off on very easy terms. "You may gamble but don't overgamble; you may bedeck yourself in your finery but don't put on all at once."

Some of the requirements of penance are however degrading. How else can I characterise the requirement to kiss the crucifix, to kiss the images of the saints, to kiss the earth? I add a few practices the confessor is instructed to impose. Among the remedies of pride are the following: "consider thy origin;—thou wert born in filth, thou art nourished in filth, thou wilt die in filth, for art thou not food for worms? Lucifer knows more than thou, and yet he is most wretched. Consider thyself vile, a useless slave, treat thyself as such; being vile, seek vile things as more suitable to thee, love contempt and rejoice in it." Among the remedies of lust are the frequent use of the whip and the hair shirt; also "to place under your nose a fetid corpse, reflecting meanwhile that not long since it was what you are and soon you will be what it is. Among the remedies of anger is to kiss the earth humbly night and morning for eight days. A person who lives in the habit of blasphemy is to be required to make on the earth five or nine signs of the cross with his tongue. He may also be advised to say 'cursed be my sins; cursed be the devil.' As to those who are tempted during the night tell them to cross their hands on their breast as soon they are in bed, to think for a little while, that such will be their posture in their coffin and in their grave, that they may die this very night; and let them add to this a short prayer to the holy Virgin, or to their guardian angel." These directions are backed up by statements of successful impositions. One or two examples must suffice. A

vain girl who had been no way benefited by various requirements was cured by this injunction. Whenever you wash your hands in the morning, say to yourself "This flesh will some time or other be food for worms." A young man given to carnal indulgences was corrected by the following: "At night as you lie in bed resolve in your mind, would you for the whole world be willing to lie for thirty years motionless in this bed even if strewn with roses? if not, what insanity to consign yourself to eternal flames for an inconsiderable pleasure." A hardened sinner who was a soldier was softened by these words "I give you, said Pope Alexander, this ring which I thus take from my own finger; on this condition that you wear it and as often as you cast your eye thereon, call eternity to mind." Another repented at this injunction "Lie in bed without moving a whole night;" in the morning he ran to his confessor declaring it to be impossible, when his confessor replied "How then will you lie confined in hell?"*

A young man who had led a very dissolute life came to Saint Philippe de Neri to make his confession. As a penance the saint commanded him to repeat the *Salve Regina* six times a day and to kiss the earth while he pronounced the words "To-morrow I may be dead." It is recorded that the young sinner obeyed. In a short time he became very religious, and fourteen years after he ended his days in a very pious state of mind.

Laws are not made against imaginary offences. If a law says "Thou shalt not steal" it says so because stealing is prevalent. Every law therefore attests the existence of the misdeed on which it sets a penalty. Viewed in this light the Romish Penitentiary assumes an historical

* Neo-Confessarius practice instructus; p. 6 seq.

character and declares important facts. These facts are chiefly of two kinds—one may be called penal inculcations, the other penal values. A penal inculcation is the indirect charge or accusation made when A. B. is threatened with e. g. imprisonment if found guilty of theft. More, the inculcation is that A. B. has committed a theft. Two things have to be noted: first, the thief; and second, the theft. To illustrate this by an imaginary example. If a domestic servant commits a theft she shall be imprisoned for one month. From such a law two things may be learnt, namely that thieving is common, and that domestic servants commit thefts. Not only so, but a penal value is here declared for six days is the punishment to be inflicted on a domestic servant who is proved guilty of thieving. This penal value may be as here absolute, that is simply so much. It may also be relative, as in the case in which a distinction is made between a male and a female domestic servant, e. g.—A domestic servant convicted of theft shall be imprisoned, if a male, for fourteen days, if a female, for twenty eight days. Here we have two values, first, the value of a theft committed by male and the value of a theft committed by a female; and second, the value of male and female in the condition of domestic servants, that is the value of both the crimes and the persons before the law, or in general estimation. A deduction from the premises shows forth the spirit of the legislation, that is, whether the legislation is mild or severe, revengeful or corrective, aggravating or remedial, outward or inward, heathenish or christian. The penitential code of the Romish church discloses the spirit by which it is animated, the degree of culture or unculture which it possesses, as well as the moral tone of its framers, and the immoral

practices of those with whom it has to deal. Moreover it reveals opinions not only as to what are crimes, but also as to rank, dignity and honour.

With these preliminaries, I proceed to make a few extracts from penitential canons sanctioned by Rome, subjoining the lessons therein taught to its adherents.

“He who does any servile work on the Lord’s day or on a holy day shall do penance on bread and water for three days. If anyone violates the fasts appointed by holy church he shall do penance on bread and water for twenty days.”

LESSONS.

- 1.—Doing servile work on Sunday is common.
- 2.—Doing servile work on a holy day is equally sinful with doing servile work on a Lord’s day.
- 3.—Violating fasts appointed by the church is common.
- 4.—Violating fasts is a sin greater than doing servile work on a Lord’s day in the ratio of twenty to three; or, in plainer terms, to violate a fast is more than six times worse than to work on a Sunday.

“If anyone publicly blasphemes God, the blessed Virgin, or any saint, he shall stand during solemnisation of mass, in an open spot before the church doors for seven Sundays, and on the last of those days he shall be without cloak and shoes, bound with a girdle round his neck, besides fasting on bread and water and being precluded from the church. On each of those seven days moreover he shall feed, if he has the means, one poor person, or two, or three; if he has not the means, he shall suffer some other penalty. He is forbidden to enter the church so long as the church refuses, and when he dies he is not to be buried with the rites of the church.”*

* Scavini Theologia III, 483.

Such is the severe punishment appointed for publicly blaspheming anyone of the numerous saints of the church. One word spoken aloud questioning their sanctity entails these pains. Thus fiercely and jealously is the Romish pantheon guarded. The *gravamen* of the penance, however, is the reducing of God to the level of the Virgin Mary, and the *dii minores* of the Romish calendar. Intended to raise and honour the creature it sinks and dishonours the Creator, making the offence of blasphemy against each of equal enormity, by punishing it with the same ecclesiastical penalties.

The degrading character of the punishment must not be passed without reprobation. Nor must we omit to bewail the ignorance of human motives which the punishment implies on the part of the church. There is something here worse than ignorance, for the penalty pursues the offender not only to but beyond the grave,—“he shall not be buried with the rites of the church.” A revengeful priesthood infallibly makes a revengeful people. Penance tends to lower its subjects to the externalities which form its essence, and to animate them with passions and impulses unworthy of men and Christians. See, too, how it takes all merit and grace from charity, by making aid to the needy not only a compulsion but a punishment.

“If anyone shall curse his parents let him do penance on bread and water for forty days; if he does them an injustice, for three years; if he strikes them, for seven years. If anyone rebels against a bishop or a priest he shall do penance in a monastery all the days of his life. If anyone shall condemn or deride the directions of a bishop or his representatives or parish priest he shall do penance on bread and water for forty days.

LESSONS.

- 1.—These misdeeds are common among Romanists, namely, 1st, to curse parents ; 2nd, to do injustice to parents : 3rd, to strike parents.
- 2.—These misdeeds are of equal enormity among Romanists, namely, to curse, injure and strike parents is of equal enormity with contemning or deriding the directions of a bishop or of a parish priest.
- 3.—To rebel against a bishop or a priest is a greater crime than to curse, injure, or to strike parents. How much greater? As much as a life-punishment exceeds a punishment of forty days.

“ If an unmarried layman has sexual connexion with an unmarried female, he shall do penance for three years. If a married woman uses *rouge* or any paint in order to please other men she shall do penance for three years.”

LESSONS.

Hence it appears that feminine excitements are, in guilt, equal to fornication, and that both are common in the church of Rome.

“ If a priest has carnal knowledge of his spiritual daughter that is her whom he baptised, or her who confessed to him, he must do penance for twelve years, and if the crime becomes known, he must be deposed and spend twelve years in penance, afterwards he is to enter a monastery and remain there all his life.

LESSONS.

There are priests who profit by their sacred office in order to gratify their lusts. The severity of the punishment may point to the frequency as well as the enormity of the crime. Detected sin is far worse than undetected sin.

“Any one desiring to commit fornication, if a bishop, shall do penance seven years; if a priest, five; if a dean or monk, three; if a clerk or a laic, two.”

LESSONS.

Bishops, priests, deans, monks, and clerks desire to commit fornication to such a degree as not to be repressed by public opinion, still less by a sense of self-respect, but to call for the coercive and punitive hand of ecclesiastical legislation.

I am warned by these last extracts to quit the subject out of a regard to decency. Before I do so, I must add that the Roman manuals and compilations termed Penitentiaries, containing as they do the inflictions enjoined by the papacy on sins of various kinds, bear to ordinary religious books the relation which “the Newgate Calendar” bears to ordinary literature. Judged by these repositories of filth* the Roman church answers exactly to the description given by (Isaiah I. 6.) “from the sole of the foot to the crown of the head there is no soundness in it, but wounds and bruises and putrifying sores.”

* Die Bussordnungen der Abendlandischen Kirche von Dr. F.W.H. Wasserschleben ; Halle, 1851.

SECTION V.

THE CONFESSIONAL—ABSOLUTION.

Confession guarantees absolution. The interposition of penance or satisfaction is for discipline. In extreme cases absolution is granted without penance. Thus Urban II. in the speech he made at the Council of Clermont on behalf of the first Crusade, offered absolution for all sins without penance to all who would take up arms in the sacred war, promising in addition eternal life to such as should fall in the holy land or on the way thereto. Absolution as a part of the sacrament of penance is sacramental. In consequence it is a judicial act performed by the priest who, as such, possesses the prerogative of forgiving sin. The act is not declaratory merely, nor is it conditional. When the priest says "I absolve thee," the penitent thereon receives pardon. We advisedly employ the term pardon, for such is the meaning of the term absolution. Hence appears the enormity of this assumption, for it is nothing less than the remission of sins. Romanists admit that for many centuries after Christ the form was deprecatory or declarative, and not judicial and authoritative. "It is certain, that down to the thirteenth or fourteenth century the form of absolution was generally deprecatory. In the fourteenth the priest in giving it said 'I absolve thee' (*Ego te absolvo*) habitually in the diocese of Paris, which was very rare in the preceding century. This is

proved by the words of William, bishop of Paris: 'The confessor does not pronounce after the manner of secular judges.' '*

Absolution applies to ordinary sins. Absolution also relieves from excommunication and the accompanying disabilities and pains. Absolution is a necessary part of the grace by which a heretic is received into church communion. The form by which this favour is conferred runs in these words—"I absolve thee from the bond of excommunication, and receive thee to the communion of the church and the participation of the sacraments in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." A modification of this rite relieves the offender after his death. After a similar manner the pope grants absolution from a suspension, by which an individual or a nation is for a time deprived of sacerdotal services, and from an interdict by which an individual or a nation is wholly precluded from worship, from marriage, from sepulture, and all that the church ordinarily performs. Excommunication, suspension, and interdict are papal inflictions of the most terrific description, employed of old with full effect, and not, or but little, employed in later days, simply because the papacy is too feeble to execute its own ordinations. These scourges have never been disowned or abolished by the see of Rome, but are kept in store against the time when the tiara shall resume its supremacy. Should the day ever come it will again rule the earth with a rod of iron. Ecclesiastical history furnishes several examples of celebrated absolutions granted by popes to powerful personages who had been smitten by papal censures. In the year 1077 Gregory VII.

* *Origines et Raison de la Liturgie Catholique* publies par l'Abbe Migne ; Petit-Montrouge, 1844, p. 990.

(Hildebrand) bestowed absolution on Henry IV., Emperor of Germany, with whom ambition had led him to quarrel. That prince, in the most inclement season of the year, set out from home with his wife and his son, yet a child, travelled across the Alps amid the greatest difficulties and sufferings, and repaired to the fortress of Canossa, where was the pope. During three days the Emperor was kept by that "vicar of Jesus Christ" at the castle gates, almost naked and without food. It was near the end of January. At last he was admitted to the pope's feet, and received absolution from his lips, being thus set free from the excommunication under which he had been laid in struggling against the aggressions of Hildebrand.

In the year 1143 pope Celestin II. received the ambassadors of the King of France, Louis VII., who had been laid under the censure of the church by Innocent II. for not having acknowledged the archbishop of Bourges, nominated by that pontiff. Affecting more than imperial pomp on the occasion, Celestin, seated on his throne and environed by a great number of persons of high distinction, gave the solicited absolution by making a sign with a cross. The Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, after the battle of 1177, in which he was beaten by the Milanese, attributing that defeat to the excommunication which pope Alexander III. had fulminated against him in 1168, went and threw himself at the feet of that pontiff in the church of Saint Mark at Venice, and so obtained absolution.

Specially worthy of note is the absolution conceded in 1595, by Pope Clement VIII. to Henry IV. of France, who not willing to lose a crown for a mass, renounced Protestantism in favor of popery. Already had the monarch been received into the church by the Archbishop of Bourges. This

absolution the pope declared null, and so compelled Henry to beg absolution from himself. All that could be obtained was that the king should appear before the pontiff by his representatives. On the 17th of December, the two ambassadors of the king, one then, the other afterwards a cardinal, clad as simple priests, presented themselves before the pontiff, seated on a lofty throne and surrounded by his sacerdotal princes. Then was read the petition of the repentant monarch, as well as the conditions of the absolution, which the two representatives promised in the name of their master to observe. Then, according to the prescribed form, they abjured the errors which were contrary to the Catholic faith. They put themselves on their knees before Clement, and as public penitents received from him several blows with a staff, while the choir chanted the *Miserere*. Then the pope rising read some prayers. After that he seated himself again, and with the tiara on his head, with a loud voice pronounced the absolution. He struck a medal commemorative of the occasion, having himself on the one side and the pardoned monarch on the other. Not to mention the absolutions granted to cities and to states, I terminate the matter by reminding the reader how our own King John received from the hands of Innocent III. the crown he had forfeited, by refusing to acknowledge as Archbishop of Canterbury a nominee of Rome. The grave relieved the kingdom from an interdict as well as its pusillanimous prince from excommunication. The days doubtless are gone for extravagances like these; and there is no fear that Queen Victoria will have to kneel to *Pio Nono* should she turn Catholic. The sole reason is, not that Rome is changed, but that the world is improved. Could Rome recover its power, it would resume the exercise of

prerogatives which it accounts its own in perpetuity, and guards with jealous secrecy as if reserving its strength for the auspicious hour. That hour will not come if England, the bulwark of Protestantism, remains faithful ; but should England prove recreant, what evil may not be feared ?

SECTION VI.

THE CONFSSIONAL—INDULGENCES.

Indulgence is a word of suspicious sound. In domestic matters indulgence is the counterpart of severity, and produces spoiled wives and disobedient children. Indulgence in government pampers the few or demoralises the many. In penal administration the rule of indulgence is the rule of uncertainty, if not caprice, and so the relaxation of justice and the undermining of law. When criminals are allowed to look for indulgence they easily reckon on impunity. Law is perfect in the degree in which its sanctions are fixed and unavoidable as well as just ; and as God's law is perfection itself, true religion can have no place for indulgence. Accordingly indulgence is a word which is not to be found in the Bible. God is just, good, merciful, gracious, longsuffering, but never is he declared indulgent. Of his own rich and overflowing love he gives and forgives, but he does not indulge. His punishments are as sure as his rewards. If we sin we must suffer the penalty due to our sin, and only when the punishment has wrought its perfect work does it cease its benignly intended strokes. Forgiveness is not the remission of a penalty,

but the cessation of a pain, and the cessation ensues not from any arbitrary appointment, but from the eternal relations of God's remedial and corrective providence. If we wish to discover the origin of the word indulgence, and the source of the practices which it now represents we must go back to the worst days of the Roman nation. During the period of its Republican purity indulgence denoted merely the relaxations which were suggested in domestic and private society by the gentle consideration naturally exercised by love and friendship in the mistakes and failures of life. Only when imperial autoeracy had seized the helm of state did indulgence intrude into political interests, and then not with a view to the public good, but to repair injuries done by tyranny, and to procure support to a tottering throne. And as the vices and crimes of the imperial sway grew and darkened, and therewith the imperial power became insecure, so were indulgences multiplied until they were lavished on the imperial armies as the price necessary to be paid for such fidelity as they chose to manifest. This brief reference to the pagan origin of indulgences points to the place they hold in the Romish church. They are the price paid by Rome for the obedience of her children. Like all unwise parents Rome requires more than human nature will bear, and then lets down her requirements to the highest point of practicable endurance. Thus by alternate severity and indulgence she humours her sons and daughters, and so rules by policy, when from her principles she is unable to rule by wise and just but rigorous and unbending law. The ideas contained in the word indulgence are Roman Catholic ideas, and as such need to be distinctly expounded. The underlying notion is the acknowledgement of merit as ex-

isting between the creature and the Creator. Christ by his sacrifice merited or earned the pardon of all sin. In virtue of his influence in their hearts the martyrs and saints merited and earned their own everlasting salvation. Nay, so good and superabounding was their merit that it far exceeded what was needful to earn their own salvation. The surplus came into the treasury of the church, and formed a fund, out of which the pope might at pleasure dispense whatsoever he pleased. Such is the divine nature of these merits that the smallest portion has an indisscribable and measureless efficacy. Out of this superfluity grants are made for suitable considerations, and these grants are what the church terms indulgences. The idea involves a kind of spiritual communism, A, B, C, and D. earn more than is sufficient to supply their wants. What they do not need is cast into a common purse, and out of that purse gifts are made by him who holds it to E, F, G, and H, who have either little talent or little industry.

I cannot help remarking in passing how untoward this notion of indulgence shows the Catholic conception of sin and holiness to be. My neighbour has two coats: I have none. Generously does he part with one of his two that I may not go unclad. The act, good in respect of clothing, is without meaning and without virtue in religion. No one can become religious by taking to another's cast off garments.

The doctrine of Rome, respecting indulgences, may be expressed in a few brief statements. These statements I shall borrow from its own authorities, translating as literally as I am able.

1. The just, by their good works done through grace, truly merit eternal glory and its augmentation.

2. There exists in the church a store of indulgences, consisting of the merits of Christ and the saints.

3. The church possesses a power, granted by Christ, of dispensing these supererogatory merits in the shape of indulgences, the use of which is very salutary to Christians.

4. Indulgences liberate those on whom they are bestowed from liability to punishment, not merely before the church, but before God.

5. Indulgences are not the mere relaxation of canonical penalties, but the remission of temporal punishments which remain after guilt and eternal punishments have been remitted.

6. Indulgences are applicable to the relief and benefit not of the living only, but also the dead who are in purgatory.

7. The relief thus granted by the church is certain and entire in the case of the living : less certain and less complete in the case of the dead.

8. Indulgences are either plenary or partial. A plenary indulgence remits all penalties, a partial indulgence remits such penalties as are indicated. Jubilees are special plenary indulgences, since, besides the relaxation of pains and punishments, they confer certain privileges on the Catholic world at large. Jubilees had their origin with Bonifacio VIII., in the year 1300. A jubilee is now proclaimed every five and twenty years. A partial indulgence lays down a limit as to time, being for one day, one year, or more. This form, in regard to time, is taken from the discipline of ancient periods, when under the penitential canons penance was to be performed for so long or so long.

9. Indulgences are bestowed by the pope and by the bishops. Indulgences of a permanent character are con-

nected with certain objects as privileged altars, chaplets, scapularies ; also certain festivals as the transfiguration, the presentation of the Holy Virgin, pilgrimages, confraternities, and different devotional observances.

10. Indulgences, then, are the remission of the penances or satisfactions imposed by the church. These, as being so imposed, avail in the court of heaven as well as in the court of the church, and, in consequence, the remission is valid not less in heaven than on earth.

These statements, which are drawn from authoritative sources,* have in them a certain vagueness, corresponding to the vagueness in which Rome has thought fit to leave the subject. Never has she determined that indulgences bear exclusively on the penalties which she herself imposes. Never has she denied that they may comprise sins in the widest acceptation of the same. While, however, she expressly teaches that they shorten or terminate the punishments of purgatory, she encourages the notion that they regard man's spiritual and eternal condition as well as his physical and present lot. This encouragement has had the natural consequence of practically leading the multitude to believe that as their entire fate is in the hands of the priests, so by indulgencies purchasable of the priests they may escape hell and gain heaven. If this is an abuse of the doctrine, it is only so when taken in its fullest import ; nor can it be doubted that the abuse has found sacerdotal sanction as well as popular acceptance. Distinctions made by casuists, to save appearances, hardly obtain currency with common-place confessors or with penitents eager to get some *salvo* for uneasy consciences. It is very certain that

* Perrone, *Praelectiones*, vol. ii., p. 587 seq. ; Spindler, *Regula Fidei Cathol.*, 1854 ; Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, 1854.

the preaching of indulgences by Tetzel and other indulgence-mongers, which was the immediate occasion of the Reformation, involved in itself, and in the expectations it produced, a belief that the pope had supreme power in heaven as well as on earth, and that this power was exercised for the everlasting welfare of those who paid the requisite fee.*

The general conclusion from these premises is, that indulgences are the spiritual capital of the church. That capital she, like any other capitalist, turns to account for her own aggrandisement. The capital has not only intrinsic value which defies measure, but magnitude surpassing the power of conception. A capital so rich and so large might naturally be expected to bring a good return. In application the capital has been more or less extended, being now restricted to penalties imposed by the church, that is, penance, strictly so-called, and now widened so as to comprehend sins of every kind. In the ages when the expansion was the greatest the capital brought the largest profits. Indeed, in the period which preceded the revival of letters the church seemed not unlikely to get into her hands all the material wealth of the globe. The result was not unnatural, for what is mere temporal good in comparison with the everlasting good the church had to bestow, and which, in her bounty, she was willing to exchange for the perishing baubles of earth and time?

Indulgences are profusely lavished. If, on the one side, Rome utters terrible menaces, on the other she is prodigal of favours. Menace and favour are alike irreligious. Enormous must be the moral relaxation occasioned by the system. Provided you confess and pay, you may be let off

* Die Deutsche Reformation der Kirche von Dr. K. G. Bretschneider. 1844, p. 66 seq.

from all impositions and penalties by a mass heard here or a prayer uttered there. And so numerous are the prodigalities that the wonder is how, even with the aid of credulity and superstition, they retain any value in public opinion. As for departed friends, and, indeed, for yourself, you may enter an assurance society, and poor and unpatronized though you are, secure by some penny a-week the recital of masses enough to procure for them a less uncomfortable place in purgatory, if not liberation from its punishments. Witness the rules which lie before me of—

“The Purgatorian Society of St. Chad’s, Manchester, for promoting the exercise of the spiritual and corporal works of mercy, incorporated with the parent society in the city of Dublin, under the patronage of St. John the Evangelist, founded January, 1818, and approved by his holiness Pope Pius VII., fourth of June, 1820, Rev. W. J. Sheehan, president : Manchester, 1850.”

Here we learn as follows :—“A number of pious and exemplary men assemble at the church, at half-past seven o’clock every Monday evening, and there recite the matins and lauds of the office of the dead for the faithful departed, and especially for the deceased members of the society and their departed parents, relations and friends. No language can describe the good these people do. It will be a source of comfort and edification to be present at the office for the dead ; and all, both those that can read and those that cannot will, by devoutly assisting at the office, carry heaven by violence, and thus hasten the deliverance of their brethren from suffering. The society has for its especial object the relief of the poor suffering souls in purgatory. Every well disposed Catholic wishing to become a member of this society, and thus contribute to the relief of the poor suffer-

ing souls in purgatory, shall pay one penny per month, to procure masses to be said for the souls of deceased members. The benefits of this society shall be applied in the following manner, viz.: all the acting members shall be entitled to three masses; and every subscriber, without distinction, to two masses at the time of their death, provided they die in communion with the church; also, that they be members for six months, and clear on the books at the time of their death (!!) Each subscriber, at the time of his or her death, shall be entitled to three offices in the following order. viz.: one at the time of their (!) death, another at the expiration of a month, and one at the end of twelve months. Two masses shall be offered every month for the suffering souls in purgatory, and especially for the deceased members, their parents, relations and friends. When the funds of the society will permit, (!) one mass shall be offered every month for the spiritual and temporal welfare of all the living members of the society."

The facts here set forth have an application on "the mass" and on "the pecuniary side of the papacy." At present they illustrate Rome's traffic in indulgences,—a traffic the essence of which may be expressed very concisely thus—

The priest will pray
If people will pay,
And those who pay
Are safe away.

At the end of "the rules" is a list of "indulgences granted to this society." Then ensue these statements:—

"The following is the answer of his Holiness to the memorial for indulgences, sent from the parent society of St. John the Evangelist, Dublin.

From the audience of his Holiness, held on the 4th of June, 1820. His Holiness Pope Pius VII., through me, undersigned, secretary of the sacred congregation of Propaganda Fide, has graciously consented to grant all the indulgences petitioned by the members of the Purgatorian Society of St. John the Evangelist, and has extended to them also those privileges and indulgences which are granted to the pious sodalities of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, under the secular clergy of St. Paul, provided they fulfil the pious works enjoined to obtain them.

Dated in Rome from the house of the sacred congregation, the day and the year as above named.

Instead of seal,

✠ C. M. Pedicini, Secretary.

The indulgences granted by his Holiness, in the above memorial, and consequently attached to St. Chad's Purgatorian Society, are—

1. A plenary indulgence on the day of being received into this Society, provided that the new member, after a good confession, worthily receives the holy Eucharist, and prays for the pious intention of the church.
2. A plenary indulgence on the Monday after the first Sunday of each month, to all the members who will devoutly assist at the mass which shall be offered on that day, for the relief of the suffering souls in Purgatory, and who will worthily offer their communion and join in reciting the office of the dead, for the same purpose.
3. A plenary indulgence on the day appointed for the quarterly office, to all the members who, after a worthy confession and communion, will devoutly (!) assist at the mass and solemn office for the dead, which are celebrated on that day.

4. An indulgence of seven years and seven quarantines to each of the members as often as they faithfully perform any of the duties prescribed by the rules of the Society.

5. All the privileges and indulgences granted to the Order of the Sacred Heart, provided the necessary conditions be fulfilled.

Lastly. Every one who recites the “*de profundis*” on his knees, for the souls in Purgatory, early every night, and joins to it the versicle, “*Eternal rest,*” &c., gains each time an indulgence of one hundred days; every one who recites the office of the dead, showing devotion, gains an indulgence of forty days.”

Here surely are indulgences enough! For one penny a month all this indulgence! This is religion made cheap as well as easy. To take a different tone—what a frightful delusion is here! and what subjection to the priest! Equally, what credulity and superstition as the cause of that subjection! What possible connexion can such a system have with the Bible or the religion of the New Testament?

The sole scriptural plea which Rome advances in justification of this degrading traffic, is found in 2nd Corinthians, 1, where the apostle Paul signifies his readiness to forgive the incestuous person, if the church were willing to do the same, by receiving him back now that he was repentant. Whatever the act was, it was not the act of the apostle so much as of the church; and the act itself consisted simply in the restoration of a penitent to church fellowship. How much must be added to transmute this simple, natural and proper display of Christian justice into a papal indulgence. Though the former can in no way justify the latter, yet the latter grew out of the former. The growth required many steps and long ages to reach its maturity.

The steps have been traced by one whose familiarity with the history of the papal church gives authority to his statements. His words therefore I shall here set down in a literal translation. "The man of Corinth had been excluded from the church, purely excluded. In a later day exclusions for a time were devised—a month, a year, two years, ten years, according to the nature and gravity of the offence. The term might be abridged, whether by a special decision found on repentance, or by a general decision, shortening at once all the penalties pronounced. For instance, to publish before hand an indulgence of a month, was to advance by a month the reconciliation of all the condemned sinners. Already on this basis many an abuse arose. A desire was felt to gain these indulgences, and this was often done by intrigues rather than by repentance. It soon became habitual to confound reconciliation with the church and reconciliation with God. Here are the first germs of the Romish system. The penalty suffered on earth being reputed to open heaven in opening the church, an indulgence which re-opened the former was considered as re-opening the latter. Did the doctrine of purgatory precede or follow that transformation? It is probable that it developed itself at the same time, at once aiding and being aided. The penalties which you did not undergo or complete on earth, you must, it was argued, undergo or complete somewhere else. Hence the notion that an indulgence had its effect in the other life as well as in this. Finally the use of disciplinary punishments having ceased altogether, there remained none but those of purgatory, and thus indulgences came to be applied solely to the latter. An indulgence of a month, of a year, of twenty years, of a hundred years, is a diminution by so much of the years you would have to pass in purgatory.

Observe that this is only the theory; if we turn to the practice, what must we say? The traffic in indulgences has been the shame and the ruin of the Romish church.

Has that traffic ceased? Under the ancient form, yes; yet not everywhere. But how many new forms! How many applications of the resources of modern industry to the vast commerce of pardons! What competition among the different markets! What lowering of prices! The prices in the olden time were at least high enough to make the purchase amount to a certain sacrifice; at present, by prudent calculation—by availing yourself of all the opportunities, you may, almost without money, amass in a year more than one hundred thousand years of indulgence. And these facilities go on increasing every year—every month. The pope cannot grant an indulgence to one society, or to one church, but the same favour is claimed by other societies and other churches. He must give to those who have not: he must double, treble, augment tenfold the privileges of those who have. The indulgence called plenary formerly cost long mortifications; a society exists which, in virtue of a brief of the pope, offers you nine per annum.*

The last words recall to my mind one of the earliest impressions I had respecting Romanism—impressions which have never left me, and which may have had something to do with subsequent studies in Romanist literature and with the production of this volume. In my youth I was *en pension* in France. In other words, I was at a French boarding school. The school was kept by a Catholic priest. As a member of the family, I saw Catholicism in

* Rome et la Bible, Manuel du Controversiste Evangelique par Felix Bungener, 1859, p. 322 seq.

its more intimate workings. I will not here attempt a description of those workings, though I may say I know them to have been bad. Specially bad were they in regard to the relations to the sexes; as for example—my master's house was presided over by the widow of an officer, and that lady was known to be his mistress. Nevertheless the school flourished, and the priest and his housekeeper were received into what was accounted good society. Over the entrance of the church at which that priest officiated I one day read these words in French—

Plenary indulgence for those who pray here to-day.

The words attracted my attention, though dimly then did I see their import; and scarcely, if at all, did I suspect their moral tendencies. What struck me then as a singularity I have long since known to be common enough. And what now must I think of a system, calling itself religious, which offers a full pardon to all and several who, on a particular day, pray in a particular spot? No wonder Monsieur B——, my teacher, lived in open fornication, and yet remained a priest of “the Holy Catholic Church.” I have reason to believe that *liaisons* of the same nature are by no means uncommon in Catholic countries.

SECTION VII.

THE CONFESSIONAL—MASS.

The mass is the principal act of worship observed by the papal church. In its essence the act is a sacrifice. It is the bloodless renewal of the sacrifice offered by Christ on Calvary. Hence the terms employed are sacrificial terms. The whole ceremony is called a or the sacrifice. Of the elements employed these terms are used, viz., *hostia* or *victima*, *victim*; *immolationes*, *things devoted*; *libamina*, *libations*. If regard is paid to the mode of offering the sacrifice it is called a *holocaust*, a *peace-offering*, or a *sin-offering*. If regard is paid to the end or object, the sacrifice is called *latreutic* being a token of obedient worship; *eucharistic* as being a token of gratitude; *impetratory* as designed to obtain favours; *propitiatory* as intended to placate God offended by transgressions. The doctrine of the Catholic church is set forth in these determinations of the Council of Trent: "If any one shall say that in the mass there is not offered to God a true and proper sacrifice, or that what is offered is anything but Christ given us to eat, let him be accursed; if anyone shall say that in those words 'Do this in remembrance of me' Christ did not make the apostles priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer his body and blood, let him be accursed; if any one shall say that the sacrifice of the mass is only an oblation of praise and gratitude, or a

mere commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the cross, but not propitiatory, or that it benefits the communicant solely and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, pains, satisfactions and other necessities, let him be accursed." If now we follow out the doctrine thus expounded into its several constituents under proper guidance* we shall find that it may be stated in the following propositions: Christ is truly, really and substantially in the sacrament of the mass and not merely as a sign, a figure, or an influence. The entire substance of bread and wine is by consecration converted into the substance of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. In the mass the victim is consumed, that is, Christ gives himself under the elements of bread and wine to be eaten orally and eucharistically, and not merely spiritually through faith. In the sacrament of the eucharistic under each of the elements (the bread and the wine), and under every part of each element, when divided, the whole Christ is contained. After consecration there is in the sacrament the body and the blood of Christ and not merely in the use while it is taken, but before and after, so that the true body of the Lord is in the host or consecrated particles which remain after the communion. In the eucharist Christ is to be adored with supreme worship. Neither the command of God nor regard to salvation requires that all and each of the believers in Christ must take both elements of the most holy sacrament of the eucharist. The church does not err while, led by just causes and reasons, it commands laymen and also clergymen, when

* Perrone; Spindler; Denzinger, *ut supra*; Baier, *Symbolik der Romisch-Katholischen Kirche*; Nutt 270, Strand, London; 1854.

not officiating, to communicate in only one element. To no one is the actual taking of the eucharist necessary as a means of salvation but only to adults by the authority of the command. Neither is the remission of sins the sole nor the chief effect of the eucharist, nor is faith alone a sufficient preparation for taking the sacrament. In the mass there is offered to God a true and proper sacrifice. The sacrifice is propitiatory for the living and the dead. Masses in which the priest communicates alone are not unlawful nor are they to be abrogated. Neither a real nor a spiritual participation of the victim on the part of the people is an essential in the sacrifice, nor are laymen held bound to liturgical communion by any precept divine or ecclesiastical. Consequently those masses are not to be condemned as invalid or unlawful in which no one communicates, whether sacramentally or spiritually. Wheaten bread, whether leavened or unleavened, is a fit and proper element of the eucharist. Only wine from the vine is a fit and proper element of the eucharist. Water is to be mixed with the wine in the cup while it is offered. Solely the officiating priest is the immediate and properly called offerer and minister of the eucharistic sacrifice; the believers who are present are nothing but mediate and improperly called offerers and celebrants. A special application of the sacrifice may be made by the priest in favour of particular persons by which they acquire special benefit. It is not allowed, nor is it desirable, to celebrate mass in only the vernacular. Not all things in the mass are to be recited aloud. There is nothing which the Catholic church uses in the ceremonies of the mass which is not sacred and pious. The last words have particular reference to the gorgeous robes of the priest, the candles, flowers, cover-

ings and other additions and decorations, especially of the altar, against which the early reformers loudly protested, and over which the Council of Trent threw its shield in these words : “ If any one shall say that the ceremonies, vestments, and external symbols which the Catholic church uses in the celebration of masses are stimulants to impiety rather than tokens of piety, let him be accursed.”

In this account of the mass we have followed our authorities as closely as possible. Most of the propositions have at their back long controversies and a heap of literature, in which are to be found their origin and explanation. Into so thick and tangled a wood this is not the place to enter. Enough thus to place before the reader the settled determinations of Rome on the matter. As we avoid the occasions and reasons of these numerous, profound and intricate dogmas, so do we not propose to inquire into their truth or falsehood, since to do so with any advantage would require far more space than is at our disposal. Nor is it necessary. The statement of these doctrines is their confutation with all who possess intelligence and are acquainted with the scripture. A few miscellaneous observations is all that we can find room for or the case now requires.

The whole is well constructed to bid defiance to common sense, to prostrate and enchain the human mind, to throw open a broad and impassible gulph between the clergy and the laity, to aggrandise the priesthood. Indeed, in this one solemn sacrifice of the church, by which bread and wine is made into God, and when become God, is consumed by God's creatures, the first becomes not only God's equal, but his superior, inasmuch as God is subject to the priest's words and manipulations. That in truth God is held to be present in the wafer, when eaten, is obvious as from what

has been said, so also from decrees of the Council of Trent, which “anathematises every one who shall declare that the body and blood of Christ, with his soul and his divinity, is not contained truly, really and substantially in the Eucharist;” and, “who shall deny the change of all the substance of the bread into the body of Christ, and all the substance of the wine into the blood of Christ.” Let us follow out the process. Here is bread. Now it is really bread. The priest pronounces over it some words. No longer is it bread. It is changed into the body of Christ, including his soul and divinity. The whole, that is the body, soul and divinity of Christ, who is God, is swallowed by the priest. Consequently, the priest first changes bread into God, and then takes God into his own bodily frame. We abstain from pursuing the shocking impiety into its remoter steps, simply adding, that if the priest does all this, the priest may well be supreme upon earth : and that a system which makes the priest supreme upon earth can never rest until it is overcome or destroyed, or has put all dominion, principality and power under its own feet

The Jesuit, Perrone, lays great stress, in his attempt to obtain scriptural proof for his teachings, on the fourth Gospel, chapter VI., 27—65, where our Lord, in order to shew forth the close spiritual inter-communion of himself and his disciples by virtue of their faith and of his spiritual gifts, employs a metaphor derived from eating and drinking. What we eat becomes, under God's wise and benign ordinations, a part of ourselves by an integral and vital union, in which the nutriment is digested, appropriated, distributed so as to enter into the composition of our bodies, repair the waste to which they are subject, and

communicate strength, health, vigour, and joy. What our aliment is to our bodies, that is Christ to our souls. It is Christ who is our spiritual food; not any notions about Christ; not any assent to human opinions touching his metaphysical nature; nor any historical conclusions as to the certainty, the time, or the place of his appearance on the theatre of the world. It is Christ himself who is our food; that is, it is the spirit of Christ as displayed in his own words and deed; it is His life which gives us life, and the virtues and energies of that life we appropriate and make our own by faith—by a living sympathy with him, involving love, trust, confidence. Hence it appears that it is a personal bond which unites the believer with his Lord, and that communion with Christ is communion by love on his part, and faith on ours—of his spirit with our spirit.

Such is the doctrine which the passage teaches. The figure is appropriate and forcible. It is easy to be understood, because it rests on an act and a process of constant recurrence in human existence. It describes spiritual facts and relations with equal truth and emphasis, and so describes them as to appeal for their verification to the experience of every religious person. This precious spiritual instruction, however, the church of Rome has materialized into what is called the doctrine of transubstantiation—a word without a meaning, a word which cannot be defined intelligibly, if only because it has not any correspondent reality in the universe of real existences.

When, however, we charge this misdemeanour on Rome, we must in justice add that its highest authority is exempt. The Council of Trent, after long and mature examination, refused to affirm that Jesus Christ in this discourse had transubstantiation in view. The decree cites one verse,

but, in applying it to the spiritual effects of the supper, observes complete silence on the discourse in the dogmatic portion of the decree. When these Roman controversialists quote it as establishing their dogma, they do that which the Council did not think it could do. When Cardinal Wiseman goes so far as to say that the chapter contains "the first proof of transubstantiation," he puts himself in complete opposition to what we know from Pallavicini* of the sentiments of the Council on the matter. Accordingly we declare, that there is not a verse in this chapter the sense of which is not wholly spiritual; and if we needed authority for saying so, we could invoke that of the Council of Trent.†

The utter disregard of scripture with which Romanism moves on in the development and enforcement of its doctrine is exemplified in its first refusing the cup to the laity, and then in its declaring that the ordinance is duly observed when only the officiating priest communicates. It was to "the disciples" that Jesus said "Take, eat, this is my body," and "Drink ye all of it" (the cup). Surely if the direct address to "the disciples" did not suffice the addition of "all" ought to have put the matter beyond dispute, and the command to "the disciples" in general to drink is, by the use of the word "all," made more emphatic than the command to eat. As to the true import "this (the bread) is my body," this "the cup" (not the wine) "is my blood," who can doubt what is the scriptural interpretation that knows that Jesus called himself a vine, a door, a way or road, a temple; and is called a lion, a lamb, a foundation and a topstone?

* *Istoria del Concilio di Trento*, Romae 1656.

† *Rome et la Bible*, p. 159 seq.

The mutual assurance society of St. Chad's in Manchester has shown us the mass as a matter that is bought and sold in the papal church. The extent to which the traffic is carried on is most fearful. Fearful, too, are its abuses, involving all the details and refinements, not to say the subtleties and tricks of trade, for the merchandize is sold wholesale and retail, for ready money and on credit, with conditions or without conditions, but never without competition. And what is sold? Bread and wine transmuted into the "divinity" on one side, and on the other the remission of God's punishments and the salvation of man's soul! Comment is here impossible, for there are no words to describe what is involved. If, however, one view of this subject makes the priest a god on earth, what shall we say of that view which represents him as making his utterances depend on the payment of "a penny a week," and his services of avail to those only who are "*clear on the books at the time of their death?*" Alas! for the poor creatures who die penniless among the penniless; purgatory, if not hell, is their everlasting doom.

IS THIS A SYSTEM WHICH ENGLISHMEN ARE WILLING TO TAKE IN EXCHANGE FOR THE GOSPEL?

SECTION VIII.

THE CONFESSIONAL—EXTREME UNCTION.

Having passed in review those sacraments and worships of Rome which are most closely connected with the Confessional, we come now to its last stage; and, at the same time, to the last stage of humanity. Here is a Roman Catholic about to depart this life. He has received all that his church can do for him. He has been baptised, confirmed, married, confessed, absolved by the priest; he has attended mass and observed his penances; nevertheless he may still be lost, although Jesus Christ has made a full satisfaction to God for his sins; and in danger of final condemnation he will be unless he receives the last sacrament,—the sacrament of extreme unction. The rite is defined, “a sacrament of the gospel instituted by Christ the Lord, by which, through anointing with holy oil and prayer, in the prescribed form, by the ministry of priests, baptised persons, when seriously ill, receive grace by which their sins and the remains of their sins are wiped away, their forces are augmented for avoiding the snares of the devil and for the patient endurance of their sufferings; and, if such a result should conduce to the salvation of their souls, the health of their body is restored.”* The passage on which this sacrament is founded is the Epistle of James, V., 14, 15: “Is any sick among you, let him call

* Perrone II., p. 421.

for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins they shall be forgiven him." Now whatever advantages are here promised, they all depend on the act of the sick person in calling for the elders of the church. Unless he call they have no right to come, and if they come not the benefit does not accrue. The sickness referred to is not defined as a sickness unto death, and so differs from extreme unction, which is administered only when persons are believed to be at their last hour. The persons whose aid is invoked are the elders of the church, who may have been spiritual ministers, but were certainly not priests. The promise is not that unction should save the sick, but the prayer of the elders,—the prayer not of a "prescribed form," but "of faith," The salvation obtained thereby is not the salvation of the soul, as little is it rescue from hell or from purgatory, but restoration to health. "The Lord shall raise him up." What the definition says about avoiding the snares of the devil and the patient endurance of sufferings is so much surplusage. Nor is the matter instituted by Christ, but simply directed by James; and what is directed is not a sacrament but a prayer. The anointing with oil, which is the central fact of the Romanist ceremony, is with James a mere incident, as being a passing admission of a usage not then become superstitious. Finally not one word is said about a sacrament. This is a pure invention of the papacy.

The text gives us a view into the interior of a primitive Christian abode, and shows us how religion mingled with its sickness and pains. The religion, so mingling, is

simple as well as sympathetic; the sympathy comes from brethren not from a sacramental order; the aid they afford is the aid of faith and prayer not of formalities. A very long way was the church from Rome in the days of James. The concluding act of extreme unction is the giving to the dying man the host or consecrated wafer brought for the purpose by the priest, or to quote Romanists words,* "it is the communion administered to a sick person to strengthen him in his transit from this world to that." Of this superstition not the faintest trace can be found in James or any other scriptural writer. The *Viaticum*, as actually administered, is described in Doblado's (Mr. Blanco White's) Letters from Spain" in the following words:—

"Just as I was walking into the nearest street to avoid the crowd, the well-remembered sound of a hand-bell made me instantly aware that unless I could retrace my steps and turn another corner, I should be obliged to kneel in the mud till a priest, who was carrying the consecrated wafer to a dying person, had moved slowly in his sedan chair from the farthest end of the street to the place where I began to hear the bell. The rule on these occasions is expressed in a proverbial saying—*al Rey, en viendolo*; a *Dios, en oyendolo*—which means that external homage is due to the king upon seeing him, and to God, i.e., the host, preceded by its never failing appendage, the bell, the moment you hear him. I must add, as a previous explanation of what is to follow, that God and the king are so coupled in the language of this country (Spain) that the same title of *majesty** is applied to both. You hear from

* La Liturgie Catholique; p. 1226.

* See the section "Ethics."

the pulpit the duties that men owe to *both majesties*, and a foreigner is often surprised at the hopes expressed by the Spaniards that his *majesty* will be pleased to grant them life and health for some years more. I must add a very ludicrous circumstance arising from this absurd form of speech. When the priest, attended by the clerk, and surrounded by eight or ten people, bearing lighted flambeaus, has broken into the chamber of a dying person, and gone through a form of prayer half Latin, half Spanish, one of the wafers is taken out of a little gold casket and put into the mouth of the patient as he lies in bed. To swallow the wafer without the loss of any particle—which, recording to the Council of Trent, contains the same divided person as the whole—is an operation of some difficulty. To obviate, therefore, the impropriety of lodging a sacred atom, as it might easily happen, in a bad tooth, the clerk comes with a glass of water, and in a firm loud voice asks the sick person, “Is his majesty gone down?” The answer enables the learned clerk to decide whether it is to be expedited by means of his cooling draught.” (p. 11). “In the more populous towns of Spain these unpleasant meetings are frequent. Nor are you free from being disturbed by the holy bell in the most retired part of your house. Its sound operates like magic upon Spaniards. In the midst of a gay, noisy party the word *su magestad* will bring every one upon his knees until the tinkling dies in the distance. Are you at dinner? You must leave the table—In bed? You must at least sit up. But the most preposterous effect of this custom is to be seen at the theatres. On the approach of the host to any military guard, the drum beats, the men are drawn out, and as soon as the priest can be seen, they bend the right knee, and invert the

firelocks, placing the point of the bayonet on the ground. As an officer's guard is always stationed at the door of a Spanish theatre, I have often laughed in my sleeve at the effect of the *chamade* both upon the actors and the company. *Dios ! Dios !* resounds from all parts of the house, and every one falls that moment upon his knees. The actors' ranting, or the rattling of the castanets in the *fan-dango*, is hushed for a few minutes, till the sound of the cell growing fainter and fainter the amusement is resumed, and the devout performers are once more upon their legs, anxious to make amends for the interruption." (p. 13.)

In a graver tone a French Catholic authority* supplies an account of the *Viaticum*, particularly as solemnised in his native country. "The *Viaticum* is the travelling provision supplied to a dying person to strengthen and support him in his journey to the other world. In the earliest ages of the church it was usual to give the communion to believers, when dead ; or, rather, to put the holy eucharist into their mouths. This was to consecrate by the truth a false belief of paganism, which taught that souls, before reaching the Elysian fields, had to pass the stream Coeytus in the boat of Charon, whom they had to pay for their passage by a piece of money. This is the reason why the pagans put in the mouth of the dead a coin destined for the purpose. The Christian wishing to smooth the way for new converts, in whose hearts they could not entirely root up the old superstition, put into the mouth of the dead this celestial coin, by the virtue of which their body, quite dead though it was, would obtain a celestial and immortal life. Accordingly the eucharist which is now given to the dying bears the name of *Viaticum*. The

* Migne, *La Liturgie Catholique*, Paris 1844, p. 1226.

Viaticum is administered to the sick by a form different from that of the Communion. The form runs thus—‘Receive, dearest brother (or sister), the *Viaticum* of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ; may it guard thee from the malignant enemy, protect thee and lead thee to eternal life.’ A decree of the 13th July, 1804, commands the military posts to pay superior honours to the holy sacrament when it is being carried to the sick, and to send at least two soldiers to act as its escort. The ecclesiastical tokens which make known that it is the holy eucharist which is to be honoured on its way, consists in this—that the priest is preceded by a bell to warn the people that the holy sacrament is carried under a *dais*, at the sides of which walk two persons, or at least one, holding a lighted torch.”

That the *Viaticum* is of pagan origin appears on the surface of these accounts. The name is pagan; the very word employed by the ancient Romans. The *Viaticum* holds the place of the penny supplied to the dead man or woman wherewith to pay his fare across the sluggish stream of death. The sole deviation of consequence is, that now the *Viaticum* is furnished to the dying instead of the dead. The word *Viaticum* (from *via* a way or journey) signifies, in good Latin, provision for travelling, that is, whatever is necessary on a journey; whether food, clothing, money. Hence it came to denote the small coin put into the mouth of a deceased person to secure his passage across the river of death. To supply this coin was accounted an act of domestic piety, and to lack it was considered a great misfortune. Hence Plautus exclaims—

Ipse abiit Acheruntem sine viatico !

Poor fellow, he is gone to the shades with not a farthing to pay his fare !

And poor enough for the spiritual world, surely, is he who carries with him nothing more real than the virtue of extreme unction ! The sole anointing which will prove of value beyond the grave is the same as that whose efficacy is known by experience on this side the grave, namely, the anointing of God's Holy Spirit. (John II., 27.)

CHAPTER III.—EVIDENCES.

SECTION I.—THE CONFESSIONAL—ITS APPEAL TO THE CHURCH AND TO TRADITION.

Every system, whether of thought or positive institution, must have an avowed foundation. What is the avowed foundation of the Romish church ? Every foundation must in its nature possess the attribute of priority. The first in its nature precedes the second, as the second precedes the third. Rome's foundation is not the pope, for it may be asked whence the pope ? Is it the scripture ? No, for the church is alleged to be anterior to the scripture. The church then is Rome's avowed foundation.

Let us consider if the foundation is solid. The church is Rome's foundation. What is Rome ? Rome is the church. The church then is the foundation of the church. That is, the church is built on the church. In other words, the church is built on nothing. If built on nothing, the church is without foundation. An edifice which is built on itself is a contradiction in terms.

I have asked what is Rome? I now ask what is the church? "The church consists of a hierarchy divinely instituted, and of a laity, the two being distinguished from each other by divine right." How is this known? The appeal is to scripture. But scripture is not yet in our hands. The scripture rests on the church, and as yet the church is without foundation. The church then, depending on scripture, depends on nothing. We are thus thrown back on our former conclusion, that the church rests on the church, that is the church is without foundation. We are still without a logical standing-place. Consequently the presumed divine authority on behalf of the hierarchy and its divinely originated distinction from the laity are utterly groundless. That divine authority, however, is referred to Christ. Christ founded the church: the church therefore is divine in its foundation. But as yet we are without vouchers of even the existence of Christ. How are we to get to Christ? What is the medium of proof? The church anterior to the scripture? What then vouches for the church? The church we have seen is logically null. On nothing nothing can be built. Without the church, we are in this issue without Christ. But even if Christ were in court, he would be there as attested by the church, and not as attesting the church. Once more then the church is its own witness; or, in other words, it has no witness at all. But the point now at issue is nothing less than its divine authority. In consequence, the alleged divine institution is without foundation. Thus defeated, Rome appeals to tradition. What is tradition? Tradition is the living voice of the church. The definition tells us nothing, for as yet the church itself is a bare definition. To say that tradition is the living voice of the church, and

to say that the church depends on tradition, is to say that the church depends on its own voice ; or in other words, that the church attests itself.

We have been endeavouring to acquire a logical basis for the church of Rome, and now report the result in brief.

1. The church, being anterior to the scripture, does not rest on scripture.

2. The church of Rome is Rome itself, or the Roman church. As then Rome rests on the church, Rome rests on itself, that is, has nothing on which to rest.

3. Rome is of divine appointment, for it comes from Christ ; but Rome rather attests Christ than is attested by Christ, for as yet Christ is an unknown quantity in the argument. Therefore Rome's divine appointment rests on her own word. As such it is simply an assumption.

4. Rome appeals to scripture to substantiate her claim ; but scripture depends on Rome. Again then Rome depends on herself, and as thus independent, is logically unsupported.

5. Rome recurs to tradition ; but tradition is nothing more than Rome in another form. Harlequin, however attired, is the same person. By tradition Rome speaks for herself, and so has no one to speak for her.

The conclusion is that the church of Rome is without foundation. As such, she is without support ; and failing in logic, must in time fail in fact.

The statement which underlies the foregoing strictures is, that the church is anterior to scripture. The inevitable consequences of that position have been seen to be ruinous to the cause of Romanism. The principle is suicidal. We turn from the consequences to the principle itself. The allegation is in itself historical. History has facts for its

substratum. On what fact does the statement repose? But historical facts rest on documents. What are the documents in the case? The scripture? Then the fact depends on the scripture; and without the scripture it is without evidence. The evidence of the fact is, then, the evidence of scripture. But the scripture, says the Catholic, depends on the church; for the church is anterior to the scripture. Whence it follows that the church is both dependent and independent of the scripture; dependent as evidenced as to its anteriority by scripture, and independent as itself evidencing the scripture. This circular logic would not obtain a moment's audience on any subject except theology.

That I have made no misrepresentation appears clear from these words translated from Perrone :*—"That the Christian Church existed before any books is equally a matter of fact, and a matter which, the nature and origin of the church being considered, as well as its documents, can be called in question by no one." What is this but to appeal to scripture on behalf of the church at the very time that scripture is maintained to be dependent on the church? But the appeal is intended to establish an authority as prior, so superior, to the scripture; that is. scripture is appealed to against itself. Scripture is not good as in itself and for itself, but good to establish something better. Two cannot be allowed to pass for two, but may be taken as of value sufficient to guarantee the payment of three.

The church is anterior to scripture, therefore the church of Rome is the mother and mistress of all churches. Such is the syllogism, and in the service rendered by this syl-

* Perrone II., p. 698.

logism is the service Rome seeks by the dictum that the church is anterior to scripture. The whole force of the matter lies in the tacit assumption of the identity of the church of Rome with the church that was anterior to scripture. But if we look to the only reliable source of information we possess, namely, the scripture itself, we find not the shadow of independent support for the assumption. The church of which Christ speaks was a church without limits as to place or time. It will not be pretended that any direct argument identifies the church of Christ with the church of Rome in the mind of Christ at the time when he speaks of "the church" and of "my church." It is only by indirect considerations that an attempt is made to exhibit the two as one and the same. The value of these considerations will shortly appear as very small, too small certainly to sustain the colossal weight of papal infallibility. Nay, there is direct proof that the church of Rome and the church in the mind of Christ were two and not one. The church of Rome involves the Roman hierarchy from the pope down to the deacon. But the hierarchy had no existence till long after the days of Christ. The hierarchy then as a fact could not be in the mind of Christ when he spoke of "my church." Where was the college of cardinals then? If you assert that they existed in Christ's mind as futurities, you say that for which you have no proof, and that which in its substance shows that they were not objective actualities—which is our position. A thought is not identical with an outer and remote fact.

It is indeed very questionable whether there was any church in existence in the days of Christ. The church could not be founded until the sphere of influences of

which it consists was fully unfolded. What was a church without a crucified and risen Saviour? and without the effusion of the spirit? It certainly was not the Christian church. Christ himself is the real foundation of the church, and Jesus had not become the Christ until he was glorified. The church as founded on Christ was a work posterior to Christ. The church could not and did not come into existence until the apostles, being fully and irreversibly converted to Christ, built the church on its one sole immoveable foundation. Under the control of these indubitable facts the terms "the church" and "my church," as employed by Jesus, could be only foregleams of the church which was established by the band of the apostles. Yet though Jesus did not found his church, he drew the plan and sketched its constitution. That plan and that constitution comprised neither pope nor cardinals, nor bishops, priests and deacons: but twelve apostles and some disciples. At the head was Jesus himself with no assessor. The members of the church were all equal, for they were all brethren, and so purely were the members all brethren that they were expressly forbidden by the one Lord to exercise lordship the one over the other. "Be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your master even Christ, and all ye are brethren." (Matt. XXIII, 8.) "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, but ye shall not be so." (Luke XXII, 25). Nay, as if in anticipation of the papal usurpation Jesus said "Call no man your father* on earth for one is your father which is in heaven." (Matt. XXIII, 9).

The view that the church is properly an apostolic institution is established by the use made of the term "the

* *Pope* in French *pape*, in Italian *papa*, signifies *father*.

church" in the New Testament. This term appears in the New Testament above one hundred times. Of these instances only one is found in the Gospels. As the word, so the thing represented by the word, is obviously posterior to Christ. And as the term "the church" is shewn to have in at least ninety-nine cases out of a hundred been current not till after the days of Christ, so may we conclude from the use of it ascribed to Christ in one single case, that the passage in which that single case occurs is of a later date, and came into existence at a time when "the church" was on every disciples' lips, and when, too, "the church" had begun to exercise moral discipline over its members, an office which it could not have discharged while yet Jesus and his little band had to fight for existence against hosts of concealed enemies and open assailants. The posteriority to Christ of the whole passage is confirmed by the un-Christ-like tone of the words—"Let him (the offending brother) be unto thee as a pagan and a publican." (Matt. XVIII, 17). How different and how inferior these words to the spirit of those which, coming immediately after, led Peter to forgive a sinning brother "until seventy times seven." (XVIII, 22). The last command says *forgive without limit*, the former *excommunicate after two trials*. The commands are incompatible. The former is Christ-like; the latter is un-Christ-like, and, as such, not of Christ. The priest rather than the Saviour appears in the words "let him be unto thee as a pagan and a publican." The poor wretch who could not be moved by private admonition, nor the expostulation of the church, was exactly and emphatically in that condition implied a few verses before (14) "the Son of Man is come to seek and save (then not to cut off) that which was

lost." Indeed the entire passage from verse 15 to verse 20 wears the appearance of an interpolation. It interrupts the tenor of the narrative, and runs right across the tone of thought and feeling which, eminently Christ-like, is deeply embedded in the words by which it is preceded and followed.

Among the numerous and diverse traditions of the church there is one which can hardly be passed over without some specific attention. I allude to the tradition that Peter, receiving the headship of the church from Christ, became the first bishop of Rome, and transmitted his prerogatives to the line of bishops by whom he was succeeded in the Roman see, which is accordingly called "The Chair of St. Peter," and gives the present pope absolute dominion over the whole of Christendom. This tradition is the basis of the papal system. What is its value? Historically and scripturally it is utterly valueless. The pretension itself did not exist at the first; and, in all its consequences, it is the growth and product of centuries. According to Romanist authorities, indeed, the tradition has an utterance in scripture. That utterance is found in Matthew XVI., 17—19. Of the true meaning of this passage I shall speak in the next section, when it will appear that the words do not bear the interpretation put upon them by the Romanists. It is not impossible, however, that they mark a step in the course which led to the full development of the papal theory. If so, they proceed from some other source than the Head of the Church. Actuated by a feeling of the kind not born of yesterday, we have searched among the earliest non-scriptural writers extant, and we have searched without finding any trace of them until we came to "The Clementine Homilies." This fact is the

more significant, because, in the Apostolical Fathers, in Apocryphal Gospels, in Justin Martyr, &c., there exist passages more or less parallel with most of the prominent texts of the Gospels. For instance, Justin has such parallel or correspondent passages in regard to all the chapters and very many of the verses of Matthew's Gospel. Indeed, he alludes to the fact mentioned in the seventeenth verse of the sixteenth chapter ; but is as silent respecting that in the eighteenth and nineteenth as if he had never heard thereof. What, then, are "The Clementine Homilies," in which the passage occurs? These homilies, as they are called, are a fiction which, coming into existence not earlier than the latter part of the second century, and calling to its aid the distinguished names of James, the Lord's brother, the first bishop of Jerusalem ; Peter, the so-called first bishop of Rome ; and Clement, commonly termed Clemens Romanus, the second traditional bishop of Rome, undertakes to magnify the episcopal power, and became the real foundation of episcopal usurpation and the papal supremacy. The work is a product of Hebrew thought, composed in the Greek language. As Jewish in spirit it aims to transfer, and did much to transfer, the Jewish hierarchical constitution into Christianity, and to exchange the simple church-brotherhood founded by Jesus for the ecclesiastical despotism of a degenerate Mosaism. The work, indeed, represents a decided tendency which arose in the second century, by which was commenced a transmutation of the outer form and the inner spirit of the church, under notions and prepossessions which had their source in the temple and the temple worship. These notions and prepossessions, scattered abroad, operated unobviously, but surely, to bring about the unhappy metamorphosis. In

process of time they took form and utterance in "The Clementine Homilies," and thenceforward gained definiteness, force, and prevalence; constantly realising themselves more and more in practises, usages, and institutions. The view I have given of this work is expressed in stronger terms by Chevalier Bunsen in the following words :—"The Ebionites rejected Paul's Epistles, and the apostolic history connected with them; and were the first at the very beginning of the present age (129 to 162 A.D.), if not at the close of the third (108 to 128 A.D.), to set up in opposition to him 'The Preaching of Peter,' a fiction which gave them an opportunity of making Peter dispute with Simon Magus, and some other Jewish and Gentile heretics. This book met with great sympathy, although not as much as the more eschatological 'Apocalypse of Peter,' which probably came from a less polluted source. 'The Preaching of Peter' was afterwards extended into a regular novel, and a very ingenious one. 'The Itinerary of Peter' was perhaps the nucleus of *the Clementine fictions* which appeared in the course of this age—about the middle of the second century. Clemens, the bishop of Rome, was chosen as the decoy-duck of the Gentiles, and made the hero of the story as being a supposed disciple of Peter whom he meets during that apostle's travels, being himself in search after truth. Of course both Clemens and Peter are transformed into purely fictitious personages. We are acquainted with two distinct forms of this novel in the shape of 'Homilies' and as 'Recognitions.' It is difficult to fix the origin of, a lie, and impossible to discover the history of a progressive fraud and fiction."*

* Christianity and Mankind, I., 129.

From the work thus described I take, first, the account it gives of Peter :—

“It is known that Simon, who, for his true faith and the very firm basis of his doctrine, was appointed to be *the foundation of the church* ; and on that account was, by the faithful mouth of Jesus himself, called Peter, with a change of name ; the first-fruits of our Lord, the first of the apostles ; to whom first the Father revealed the Son ; whom the Christ declared blessed ; who was called and chosen, and made a guest and a companion ; the good and approved disciple ; who, as being more fit than all, was appointed to enlighten the darker part of the world—the west, and who was enabled to perform the work :—he, on account of his measureless affection toward men, in order clearly and publicly to declare the coming king to all the world, *came hither as far as Rome* itself, saving men by a teaching approved by God, and passed from the present life by a death of violence.”*

Peter hands over his episcopal supremacy to Clement in the following words : I prefix the introductory words, being addressed by Clement to James :—

“In those days in which he (Peter) was about to die, the brethren being called together, suddenly taking me by the hand, he (Peter) arose and said before the church : Hear me, brethren and fellow-servants, since as I have been taught by him who sent me, our Lord and Teacher Jesus Christ, the day of my death approaches, I ordain this Clement as your bishop, to whom I confide my chair of instruction ; wherefore I transfer to him *authority to bind and to loose*, that whatever he shall ordain on earth shall be

* Homil. Clement., Epist. ad Jacob, l. Ed. Dressel ; Göttingen, 1853.

ratified in heaven ; for he shall bind what ought to be bound, and shall loose what ought to be loosed ; as one who knows the law of the church. Listen, then, to him, as persons who know that he who grieves the president of truth (true president) sins against Christ, and angers the Father of all ; on account of which he shall not live."*

By combining this quotation with what precedes we obtain not only the words occurring in Matthew XVI., 17—19, but a pretty full and sharply-defined development of the pretensions of Rome. The metaphor of binding and loosing had become common, and was used to describe the episcopal functions of discipline, but without involving the exclusive supremacy of the bishop of Rome. Thus Clement says to James :—

"And so let them listen to thee, knowing that whatever thou, the minister of truth, bindest upon earth is bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou loosest is loosed ; but thou wilt loose what ought to be loosed, and bind what ought to be bound. These and the like things are those which pertain to thee who art the president." †

Here we have the very words applied to James which in Matthew XVI., 19 are applied to Peter.

In the same way Peter, selecting and ordaining Zacchæus to be bishop, utters on his behalf this prayer :—

"Do Thou, the ruler of rulers, and Lord of lords, and Sovereign Master of kings, give to this president to loose what ought to be loosed, and to bind what ought to be bound." ‡

* Clement. Romani Homil. Ep. Clement. ad Jac., s. 2.

† Hom. Clement. Epistola C. ad Jacobum, s. 6.

‡ Clement. Hom. III., 72.

Without attempting to exhaust the subject, we find in these quotations the following statements respecting Peter. We add that here, for the first time, these statements as a whole make their appearance in at least non-scriptural sources. The statements are, that Peter, 1, was made the foundation of the church; and 2, as a token had his name changed from Simon to Peter; 3, was Christ's first convert; 4, was the first to whom the Father revealed the Son; 5, was the first (or prince) of the apostles; and 6, travelled to Rome, where he suffered martyrdom.

First, let us put these statements into a continuous form: Peter the first convert of Christ, to whom, first, the Father revealed the Son, who was the first of the Apostles, and whom the Lord appointed as the foundation of the church, and in token of that appointment changed his name from Simon to Peter, travelled to Rome where, in the exercise of his divinely-bestowed supremacy, he founded the church and underwent a violent death. This, it will be seen, is the very substance of the papal pretensions. The origin, then, of those pretensions is a "novel," a "fiction," a "fraud," a "lie." The pretensions have Rome for their birth-place and a reputed Roman bishop for their author. Thus Rome is the mother of the inventions which form the substance and the basis of her usurped dominion.

I shall briefly survey the six principal statements of the passage,—

1: Peter was made the foundation of the church. The word foundation is never used of Peter in the scriptures; nor even in the disputed passage is that word used; and Paul declares that "*other* foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ," (1 Cor. III, 11) and Peter, as well as other primitive teachers, he characterises

as "the ministers (or servants) of Christ," (1 Cor. IV, 1) rebuking as carnal and anti-Christian the disposition to recognise human authority in the church which has but one head, Christ. (Ephs. I, 22 ; IV, 15 ; Col. I, 18). Christ then is the foundation, as he is the top-stone, of the Christian temple, and there is no other foundation nor any other head than Christ.

2. The name Simon was changed into the name Peter to mark and designate Peter as the founder of the church. The idea is this : *Petra* in Greek signifies a stone, and from *petr(a)* comes *Petr(os)*, the English form of which is Peter. Now the alleged adoption of Peter, because *petra* signifies a stone or rock, implies that the adopter spoke Greek. But Jesus did not speak Greek ; Jesus spoke the Western Aramaean—a degenerate form of Hebrew. Consequently Jesus neither could nor did give Simon the name of Peter either primarily or in exchange. The play, however, on the impôt of *Petra* betrays the Greek origin of the so-called exchange. That Simon had the name of Cephas is beyond a question, for by that name he is spoken of by Paul several times. (1 Cor. I, 12 ; III, 22, &c.) But Cephas in the Bible signifies properly a eave, being in form as well as meaning cognate with our *cave*. Not an inappropriate designation was this for one who had so little solidity as Simon possessed while he had intercourse with Christ ; nor would it be an incorrect designation of the hollow system of the papacy. A loose translation of Cephas by *petros* seems to lie at the foundation of the whole matter. However this may be, certainly in Matthew's Gospel (XVI, 18) no change of name is mentioned. The words of Jesus, "thou art Peter," declare a fact not make a promise. "Thou art Peter," implies that already Simon was called

Peter. Nor does John (I, 42) speak of an exchange of names, but merely says "thou shalt be called Cephas" (Peter) and this he does without assigning the reason given in "The Clementine Homilies." Yet in the alleged reason lies the point of support Rome here seeks to gain. And if John knew and recognised Peter's supremacy, and if when John wrote, Peter in himself and his successors had long been reigning in Rome over the church universal of which he was the foundation as his very name indicated, surely he would not have omitted the reason had he known any thing thereof. The express omission of the reason on the part of John admits of explanation if we suppose that he either did not find it in another Gospel or wished to mark it with his disapprobation. Another and a considerable objection is this : Had the name Peter been given by Jesus in exchange for Simon in order to designate him as the foundation of the church, it could not have failed to be habitually used by Jesus, since it was his own selected designation of Simon as his vicegerent on earth. It is not so used. On the contrary, the apostle is addressed by his Lord not as Peter but as Simon, and that too even after his resurrection.* It was not indeed an exchange of name that in fact took place, but rather an additional or surname that was taken, for the disciple is afterwards called either Simon, Peter, or Simon Peter ; and he himself who best knew what his name was had not dropped the term Simon when he wrote the genuine part of what is called his second epistle, for he commences the scripture with "*Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ.*" It was not unusual for the Jews to make some change in

* See Matt. XVII, 25 ; Mark XIV, 37 ; Luke VII, 40 ; XXII, 31 ; John XXI, 15.

their name when they made a change in their religion. Thus Saul became Paul. In some such change made by Peter himself may possibly lie the germ of the traditions fostered by Rome into pretensions unequalled in magnitude and arrogance.

3. Peter was the first convert made by Christ. The ground of the claim is, that Peter first acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah. The statement is contradicted by scripture. John the Baptist is described as bearing to Jesus the following testimony, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world;" "this is the Son of God." In consequence of this, "Andrew, Simon Peter's brother," having found Peter, declared to him "We have found the Messiah, which is being interpreted Christ, and he brought him (Simon) to Jesus; and when Jesus beheld him he said "Thou art Simon, thou shalt be called Cephas." (John I., 35 seq.) Not to urge the Christian tenor of John's confession, I ask attention to the fact that Andrew was in the church before Peter, and that Peter was introduced into the church by Andrew. In John's Gospel, too, the hour of Simon's introduction to the church witnesses the addition of the name of Cephas to that of Simon, whereas in Matthew XVI. the date of the transaction is far on in the evangelical history.

4. Peter was the first to whom the Father revealed the Son. This cannot appear true to any one who has considered the facts just set forth. On this head, however, the Baptist employs words of singular emphasis:—"And I knew him (his person) not, but he that sent me to baptise with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptiseth with the Holy Ghost; and I saw and

bear record that is the Son of God." (John I., 33, 34.) John the Baptist both knew and revealed the Son before Peter.

5. Peter was (and is) the first of the Apostles. There is no scriptural authority for the statement. That Peter, James, and John appear prominent in the evangelical narratives is unquestionable. It may be added that Peter, from his impulsive nature, frequently puts himself forward and is sometimes the mouth-piece of the apostolic body. These facts, however, by no means involve or imply a primacy as of station, or position, or dignity. Such a distinction and such a supremacy are never declared by Jesus, but on the contrary are expressly disallowed; for did He not describe his apostles in these words—"All ye are brethren." Matthew, it is true, uses the word first (*protos*) of Peter; and our authorised version translates this by the words "*the first*;" whereas the Greek has no article, and no article should be introduced. The term "first" denotes not rank, but the beginning of a series, the several links of which are not continued. Any priority, however, that may be thought involved in this, and in the corresponding fact that Peter's name stands first in the list of the apostles given by Mark and Luke, is sufficiently explained by what has been said already.

It may be desirable here briefly to set forth what view on this question of pre-eminence is involved in Peter's own words. It is natural to suppose that, had he been made by Christ the foundation of the church and "the prince of the apostles," he would, from the first of his appearing in his apostolic character, have taken up the position to which he had a divine right, and from which he could not recede without disregarding an imperative

duty. There is no trace whatsoever of such an assumption. On the contrary, Peter, even when he speaks as the representative of the church, classes himself with his fellow-apostles, and describes himself and them in terms which imply equality one among the other. Thus, on the day of Pentecost, he stood up with the eleven, and addressing the Jews, said—"This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof *we all are witnesses*. (Acts II., 32 ; Comp. V., 32.) Immediately before he had termed the disciples generally, in number about one hundred and twenty, "Men, brethren,"—that is, as we should say, "My brethren,"—(16) speaks of the office of apostle as that of a witness (22), and makes the "ministry and apostleship" one homogeneous whole (25). The same unambitious position is taken and held by Peter in his epistle (1), where he terms himself "*an* apostle of Jesus Christ" (I., 1), one of the preachers of the Gospel (12), an elder among elders, one witness out of several (V., 1), who are shepherds immediately under the chief shepherd (2, 3). The modesty of the writer is indeed manifest throughout the letter, not merely nor yet so much in the passages cited, as in the almost entire absence of reference to his own person and position ; keeping himself for the most part in the back-ground, the apostle in this description contrasts most favourably with the swelling pomposities, the ill-concealed ambitions, and the affected humilities of the official documents which the popes—his alleged successors—are wont to address to their adherents. Were the mind of papists left, though but a little, open to light, the perusal of Peter's preachings and writings, especially if compared with papal missives, would, one may think, suffice to make them simple and glad disciples of Jesus Christ.

We must not leave this branch of our subject without advertg to the relations in which Peter in his letter places Christ and Christians one to another. Had that apostle been conscious of having been made the foundation of the church in any sense, hardly could he have failed to put forward his claim, especially when he is led (II, 6) to speak of Christ in a similar light, namely, a "chief corner stone, chosen and precious," belief in which (whom) would issue in salvation. Here, however, is the foundation, the sole foundation. But, replies the Romanist, the pope represents on earth that one foundation. Then explain how it was that Peter, thus drawn to the subject, says not one word to that effect. Nevertheless in this very connexion he requires honour and submission to "every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake," and specifies the authorities he has in view. The list does not include himself. Toward the end of the chapter he is led into the midst of church relationships (17, 25), and what are they? Brotherhood on the one side, and the chief shepherd on the other. The word bishop falls indeed from his pen, but Peter's bishop is neither himself nor the bishop of Rome, but the one and the sole Bishop of the Church, even he who styled himself "the good shepherd." (John XIV, 1). In view of that good shepherd, in view of the descriptions of him contained in scripture, and in view also of the fact that the good shepherd did lay down his life for the sheep, one cannot but wish that in very deed the popes had been the successors of Peter even as he was a follower of Christ.

So deeply engraven on the apostle's mind is the idea of Christian brotherhood that, as he passes on in his letter, he returns to the point, saying, "love as brethren" (III, 8), and "above all things have fervent charity among your-

selves " (IV, 8), and then when on the point of concluding he alludes to the earthly pastors, he charges them to feed the church *not "as being lords over God's heritage, but as examples to the flock."* (V, 3). These last words crown the whole, for they not only manifest the true spirit of a Christian elder, but they condemn and reprove the usurpations and despotism of the papacy in all the degrees, nay in the essence and substance, of its hierarchy.

6. The last statement presented in Clement's letter to James is that Peter travelled to Rome and there suffered martyrdom. Involved in this statement is another, namely, that Peter became bishop of Rome. Even were the allegation sufficiently supported, Peter would not be the first bishop of the church, for he was preceded by James, bishop of Jerusalem; nor could Rome be Peter's first bishopric, for the tradition on which the whole story rests makes Peter to have been bishop of Antioch before he was bishop of Rome. It follows that Rome is not the most ancient of bishoprics. The traditions, however, on which Rome here relies are of no value. Let a catholic authority report them.* "The universal tradition teaches us that Peter was the first bishop of Antioch though not for seven years. According to the same authority it is certain that he governed the church at Rome as its first bishop, although he did not remain constantly there, and it was not till the year 43 or 44 that he took up his permanent abode in the city. Finally he received the palm of martyrdom during the persecution under Nero." Now this supposition of removal from and return to Rome is simply a theory in order to help a lame tradition which is incompatible with

* "Allgemeines Wörterbuch, edited by a Union of Catholic Scholars," with a supplement by Dr. I. F. Allioli.

scriptural facts. The theory is moreover expressly contradicted by Jerome, who declares that Peter continued for five and twenty years preaching the Gospel in Rome as its bishop. If Peter was bishop in Rome for five and twenty years and suffered death under Nero in A.D. 64, he must have commenced his episcopal duties in A.D. 39, whereas Eusebius makes him enter on them in A.D. 42. Seven years, however, says tradition, he had passed in the bishopric of Antioch before he went to Rome. This would make him bishop of Antioch in A.D. 32. But it is the opinion of the most competent scholars that the ordinary commencement of the Christian era, which was not fixed till after the lapse of several centuries, is four or five years too late, and that instead of coinciding with the year of Rome 754, the birth of Christ should be placed in the year of Rome 749 or 750. Jesus, the scripture tells us, was about 30 years of age when he entered on his public ministry. His public ministry then began in the year of Rome 779. That ministry lasted three years. Thus we come to 782 as the date of the crucifixion. This corresponds with the true year of Christ 32 or 33. Consequently Peter was bishop of Antioch either one year before or in the very year in which Jesus died. But at this time he was, we know from the Gospels and the Acts, in Palestine. From the time of the crucifixion the apostle appears in the New Testament intently engaged in building up the infant church in Judæa. What length of time he was so engaged we have not data for exactly determining, but certainly he was found in Jerusalem by Paul when Paul went up thither three years after his conversion. (Gal. I, 18). The precise date it is difficult to ascertain, but we are safe in placing it before the year 40. About the same time

Peter is recorded to have been at Joppa and in Jerusalem (Acts X, XI), being spoken of in a way which suggests the idea that Judæa was the spot on which he bestowed his cares. In the fourth year of the Emperor Claudius (A.D. 44), when the murder of James the elder took place, Peter is in prison in Jerusalem. (Acts XII, 4). When set at liberty he would regard it as his duty to continue his labours in the same country. Accordingly we find Peter present at the council held in Jerusalem in the year 52.

Thus the New Testament places Peter in Jerusalem in the year 32, in the year 44, and in the year 52; also in years between 32 and 44; while it implies that at least a part of the interval between 44 and 52 was spent by the apostle in Judæa. The general conclusion authorised by scripture is, that up to 52 Peter laboured in Palestine. On occasion of the Council held in 52, Peter and Paul came to an understanding to the effect that, while the latter had been divinely sent to the Gentiles, the former had received a commission to the Jews. (Gal. I., 7 seq.) This understanding was no less prospective than retrospective. It determined what should be, by ascertaining what had been. Thus it, in effect, marks Peter as already exercising his ministry in his native land, and as intending to continue in the same divinely assigned and divinely sanctioned labour. It must be added that not one word of scripture expressly connects Peter with Rome. In consequence, its general and uniform tenor makes Judæa the ground which Peter tilled. Nor, indeed, could Peter have founded a bishopric in Rome without abandoning his own field, and intruding into the province of Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles. We have brought the scriptural evidence

down to the year 52, and found Peter engaged in Judæa. A few, probably about six, years after, Paul writes a letter to the Romans. At this very time Peter, declares the Roman tradition, was bishop of the metropolis of the world. The fact that the letter was written proves the contrary: for, had Peter made Rome his seat, Paul would not have written to Rome, for in the letter (XV., 20) he declares that it was with him a rule not to build upon another man's foundation. However, had Peter then occupied the episcopal chair in that city, surely he would in some way have been noticed by Paul. Some thirty persons are saluted by the apostle, but no mention is made of either Peter or any other bishop. Indeed, the fragmentary notices we have of the Roman Church give no idea of an hierarchically constituted organisation, and the probability is, that the Christian community there existed as yet only in germs. Such is certainly the conclusion suggested by the terminating verses of the Book of Acts (XXVIII., 16 seq), where we find an outline of the events which attended Paul's appearing in Rome on the occasion of the appeal which he made to Cæsar. On the supposition that a regularly constituted church existed there the apostle would naturally have thrown himself on their sympathy and support. Instead he addresses himself "to the chief of the Jews." They, uninstructed as to the principles of Christianity, ask Paul for information, alleging that the sect is everywhere spoken against. Only partial success attends the preaching of the Gospel by the lips of Paul. The apostle thus disappointed of fruit among those to whom it was Peter's special business to minister, turns to the Gentiles. For the purpose of addressing them does he enter any existing community? does he associate with any brethren? does he

connect himself with any presiding bishop? No mention is made of anything of the kind. Paul hires a house and preaches there for two years, receiving all who come. All this betokens clear ground. It may even be doubted whether there was at the time any other church in Rome but such as is found wherever two or three are gathered together in the name of Christ. (Matt. XVIII. 20). In agreement with this the only church mentioned is an infant community which met in the house of Priscilla (Prisca) and Aquila (Rom. xvi, 3) not to urge the significant fact that Paul addresses his letter not to the church of God in Rome according to his wont but "to all that be in Rome." If instead of throwing ourselves on conjecture or leaning on the rotten staff of tradition, we take counsel of scriptural data we shall see reason to conclude that when—and of course before—Paul reached Rome scarcely more than scattered seed lay on the field sprouting into growth and appearing in individual converts who consorted together for mental instruction and solace. These persons seem to have been among the first fruits of the preaching of the word in different parts of the empire. Some may have been present at the day of Pentecost; others may have heard Paul in his missionary tours (3—6); some had been converted before Paul (7); several were Paul's coadjutors, friends and kinsmen (3—11). Not one convert made by Peter is mentioned. Not the slightest trace of Peter's presence or working is found. Everything leads to the conclusion that Paul, not Peter, was the founder of the Roman church.

The last months of the life of Paul are not easily filled up with the events by which they were occupied; where he was, and what he did, may be conjectured, but cannot be

said to be known. One thing is certain, namely, that his second epistle to Timothy was written when he was in prison and near his end for the cause of Christ. (2 Timothy, I, 12, 16; 11, 9, 10; IV, 6). According to the traditions, Paul and Peter suffered martyrdom in Rome, A.D. 64. The second epistle to Timothy, then, was written at the time when the two Apostles were together in Rome awaiting the crown of thorns, does the letter warrant the conclusion? It contradicts the conclusion, for Paul expressly declares "only Luke is with me" (IV. 11). Besides, the Apostle is deserted by those who should have been at his side; "At my first answer (hearing) no man stood with me, but all forsook me; I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge" (16). If then Peter was at the time in Rome he forsook Paul,—and to whom does Paul look for sympathy and support? It was natural to look to the Bishop of the Church if Bishop there was; Paul looks not to Peter, who was at hand, if the supposition is well founded, but to Timothy, who was at a distance; to whom he says urgently "do thy diligence to come shortly unto me, for Demas hath forsaken me," &c. (9, 10).

From the year 42 to the year 64 Peter, says the papacy, was Bishop of Rome. We have put the assertion to the test of scripture, and we have found Peter again and again in Judea, but never in Rome; on the contrary, all the indirect as well as the direct indications of his agency make the East and not the West, the circle of his operations; and the Jews not the Gentiles, the objects of his care. To all this scriptural evidence Catholics have no scriptural reply to make. They do all that they can do by conjecturing that Peter left Rome on missionary expeditions from time to time; but they must first place Peter in Rome

before they are at liberty to make him leave Rome. Besides, a conjecture founded on nothing is worth nothing. But Peter, they allege, addresses his first epistle from Babylon (V. 13), and Babylon in the apocalypse (XVI, 19) denotes Rome. It is not correct to say that Peter addresses his epistle from Babylon; what he really does is to send greetings from the church at Babylon, which, without being there himself, he might have been requested to do. Nor is it the city of Rome that is meant by Babylon in the Apocalypse, for then the denunciations of the book would have fallen on its christian as well as pagan inhabitants; but the idolatrous Roman empire, of which its metropolis was the centre and the representative. The place intended by Peter was Babylon, the seat of the ancient capital of the Eastern world, which, though now in ruins, afforded a home to a church of Christ.

We have thus shown that the tradition which asserts the primacy of Peter at Rome is contradicted by scripture. Equally easy would it be to shew that the tradition itself is without validity. An indispensable preliminary even to the investigation of a tradition is, that it should be uniform. In the matter before us, the only thing uniform is the pretension, and the pretension acquired its present uniformity only by degrees. Nor is it in any but a qualified sense that the pretension can be termed uniform now; for there is only a partial agreement as to the extent of the papal authority and jurisdiction. If, however, from the claim as put forth at present we go back to the traditionary materials out of which it is fabricated, we find in those materials very great diversity. It might surely be expected that a right to govern the world of human thought, and so to govern the entire social world as its sovereign, uncontrolled

and irresponsible lord, should historically rest on some voucher clear in meaning and of unquestionable authority. If we ask for a voucher of the kind we ask in vain. Vouchers, however, are produced, but what do they vouch? They vouch not one thing, but different things; and vouching different things in a matter where unity is indispensable, they are of no value. Thus, if we consult the very doctors of the church to whom Rome is accustomed to refer as constituting her tradition, we are met with various and conflicting answers as to the primitive condition of the episcopate at Rome. Epiphanius makes Paul, as well as Peter, bishop of that city. Augustin, following "the Apostolical Constitutions," makes Linus to be nominated by Paul to the episcopate of Rome; and Clement by Peter; thus establishing there two bishops at once, while the Clementines, Tertullian, Optatus of Milevum (in Numidia), Irenæus, Eusebius, give only one. The Clementines and Tertullian inscribe Clement in the first place, Linus in the second, and Anacletus in the third; but Optatus names Linus in the first, and Clement in the second; and—another diversity—Irenæus and Eusebius assign the first place to Linus, the second to Anacletus, and the third to Clement. If we believe Jerome we shall hold that Peter came to Rome in the second year of the reign of Claudius (A.D. 42); while, if we believe Lactantius, the apostle was not in Rome until Nero (A.D. 54) was on the throne. Enquiring of Jerome how long Peter ruled as a bishop, we receive for answer—a quarter of a century; putting the same question to Nicephorus we are told it was but two years. Rufinus represents Linus and Cletus as bishops of Rome while yet Peter was alive, and puts Clement in the third place; while Eusebius and others

speak of Linus as attaining to the episcopate not till after Peter's death.*

In order to present the facts in a clear light I arrange them under the following heads.

THERE WERE AT ROME IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE TWO
EPISCOPATES,—

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1.— <i>Single Episcopate.</i> | 2.— <i>Compound Episcopate.</i> |
| a.—Descent from Peter. | Peter and Paul. |
| 1.—Peter. | Peter, Linus, Cletus. |
| 2.—Clement. | |
| b.—Descent from Paul. | |
| 1.—Paul. | |
| 2.—Linus. | |
| c.—Descent from Clement. | |
| 1.—Clement. | |
| 2.—Linus. | |
| 3.—Anacletus. | |
| d.—Descent from Linus. | |
| 1.—Linus. | |
| 2.—Clement. | |
| e.—Descent from Linus. (again) | |
| 1.—Linus. | |
| 2.—Anacletus. | |
| 3.—Clement. | |

Thus instead of one bishop, Peter, as the undoubted first bishop of Rome, we have

FOUR FIRST BISHOPS OF ROME.

Paul,
Peter,
Clement,
Linus,

* Les Origines de l'Eglise Romaine par André Archinard, 2 vols., 8vo., Paris, 1852.

in addition to a claim from Cletus to be as much first as Peter and Linus. Four first bishops of Rome ! To make more than one first in any series surpasses the power even of the pope. However, if Peter has three competitors for the honour of the primacy, his claim is but one against three, and such a claim is hardly strong enough to justify despotism and infallibility.

It would be easy to add to these diversities from ancient authorities. We content ourselves with transcribing from modern authorities which lie at hand the following :—

Different lists given by different modern Romanist authorities.

<i>Migne.</i>	<i>Dizionario de' Erudizione.</i>	<i>Dictionnaire d'Histoire.</i>
1. Peter . . A.D. 54	1. Peter . . A.D. 44	1. Peter . . A.D. 34
2. Linus . . , 63	2. Linus . . , 69	2. Linus . . , 66
3. Clement. , 67	3. Cletus . . , 80	3. Anaclethus , 78
4. Cletus. . , 77	4. Clement. , 93	4. Clement. , 91
5. Anaclethus , 83	5. Anaclethus , 103	5. Euaristus , 100
6. Euaristus , 96	6. Euaristus , 112	

Here we find these diversities : Peter was elected in A.D. 34, 44, and 54 ; Linus in 63, 66, and 69 ; Clement in 67, 91, and 93 ; Cletus in 77 and 80 ; Anaclethus in 78, 83, and 103 ; Euaristus in 96, 100, and 112. Clement stands in order third and fourth ; Euaristus fifth and sixth ; Cletus third, fourth, and nowhere.

The diversities thus educed from ancient and modern authorities suffice to shew that nothing is — and that nothing can be—known respecting the first bishops of Rome. The authorities are conflicting both as to the order of persons and the times of their election ; and it is equally uncertain whether Peter was the first bishop, or Paul was the first bishop. It is most probable that neither

Paul nor Peter was the first bishop. Who was the first bishop, who the second, who the third no one can tell. The papacy has no historical basis whatever. It lacks a foundation. No matter what power, or whether any power was given by Jesus to Peter, Peter's connexion with the see of Rome is simply a fiction.

The opinion thus put forward is supported by names of the highest authority. We cite as formally denying that Peter was invested with the episcopal office in the city of Rome, among Protestants, C. Saumaise, F. Spanheim, Bower, Eichhorn, Baur, Mayerhoff, Winer, De Wette, Neander, Rettberg, Schwegler; among Catholics, Father Pinel and Ellendorff. We conclude the section with a few lines transcribed from a writer deservedly held in high repute wherever sound and elegant learning is valued. "Like almost all the great works of nature and of human power in the material world and in the world of man, the papacy grew up in silence and obscurity. The names of the early bishops of Rome are known only by barren lists, by spurious decrees and epistles inscribed centuries later with their names; by their collision with the teachers of heretical opinions, almost all of whom found their way to Rome; by martyrdoms ascribed with the same lavish reverence to those who lived under the mildest of the Roman Emperors, as well as those under the most merciless persecutors. After the *embellishment, if not the invention, of St. Peter's pontificate*, his conflict with Simon Magus in the presence of the Emperor, and the circumstance of his martyrdom, the mythic or imaginative spirit was content with raising the successive bishops to the rank of martyrs, without any peculiar richness or fulness of legend."*

* Milman's "Latin Christianity," vol. I., p. 22.

A short extract from John Milton, illustrating, in words only too apposite to the present hour, the worthlessness of ecclesiastical tradition will appropriately conclude this section. "When men began to have itching ears, then not contented with the plentiful and wholesome fountains of the Gospel, they began to heap to themselves teachers ; and as if the divine scripture wanted a supplement, and were to be eked out, they cannot think any doubt resolved, and any doctrine confirmed, unless they run to that undigested heap and fry of authors which they call antiquity. Whatsoever time or the heedless hand of blind chance hath drawn down from of old to this present in her huge dragnet, whether fish or sea-weed, shells or shrubs, unpicked, unchosen—these are 'the Fathers.' Seeing, therefore, some men deeply conversant in books have had so little care of late to give to the world a better account of their reading than by divulging needless tractates, stuffed with specious names of Ignatius and Polycarpus, with fragments of old martyrologies and legends, to distract and mislead them from their strong guards and places of safety under the tuition (protection) of Holy Writ, it came into my thought to persuade myself, setting all distances and nice respects aside, that I could do religion and my country no better service for the time than doing my utmost to recall the people of God from their vain foraging after straw, and to reduce them (lead them back) to their firm stations under the standard of the Gospel by making appear to them, first, the insufficiency, the inconveniency, and lastly, the impiety of these gay testimonies that their great doctors would bring them to dote on." "And thus much for this—cloud I cannot say rather than petty fog—of witnesses with which episcopal men would cast a mist before us to

deduce their exalted episcopacy from apostolic times. Now although, as all men know, it be the wonted shift of error and fond opinion, when they find themselves outlawed by the Bible and forsaken of sound reason, to betake them with all speed to their old starting hole, tradition—that wild and overgrown covert of antiquity—thinking to frame there a large room and find good stabling; yet thus much their own deified antiquity betrays them (as) to inform us that tradition hath had very seldom or never the gift of persuasion; as that which church histories report of those eastern and western Paschalists formerly spoken of will plainly declare. Who would have thought that Polycarpus on the one side could have erred in what he saw Saint John do; or Anicetus, bishop of Rome, on the other side, in what he, or some of his friends, might pretend to have seen Saint Peter or Saint Paul do; and yet neither of them could persuade the other when to keep Easter.” (Of “*Prelatical Episcopacy.*”)

SECTION II.

THE CONFESSIONAL—ITS APPEAL TO THE FOUR MARKS OF THE TRUE CHURCH.

We have gone round about Rome and told the towers thereof; we have marked well her bulwarks and considered her forts (Ps. XLVIII. 12), and the result is any thing but favorable to her impregnability and permanence. Not the Zion of our God do we find there, but a rough and ill-assorted heap (*rudis indigestaque moles*) of “wood, hay,

and stubble," which even now the fire is trying, and which a yet purer and stronger flame of divine truth will inevitably destroy. (1 Cor. III. 11 seq.) The papal advocate, however, is prepared with a plea in bar of judgment, and says, Enter the city, make yourself familiar with her chief magistrate, study her laws, review her virtues, observe the order, notice her stability, and you will, beyond a doubt, be smitten with a recognition of the divine, and exclaim truly "God is in the midst of her, she shall not be moved." (Ps. XLVI, 5.) We accept the invitation, and ask the advocate to become our guide; he condescends to the office and points to four categories or classes of facts, which comprise the claims of Rome. "Here," he says, "are marks of the divine; study these marks, and you will admit the divinity of my church. So divine a work can have come from no hand but God's."

The pretension is that the Roman church, or the church whose seat is at Rome, is *the* church—the church of Christ—the only true church; and that in such a sense that it is the mother of all other churches, which exist as churches only in virtue of an organic union with the Roman church, and so are not so much separate churches as branches of the one sole church—the church of Rome. Thus the church of France, the church of Spain, the church of Austria, bear the title merely as national churches, and derive their right to the name church, only from their integral union with the church of Rome. Being the true vine, out of which no so called christian community can flourish, the church of Rome possesses the prerogative and lies under the obligation of teaching and governing all its branches, of bringing under its influence all who stray, and of subjugating to its sway the whole world.

The church of Christ is characterised by four notes or

features, namely: 1, unity, 2, sanctity; 3, catholicity; 4, apostolicity; or it is 1, one; 2, holy; 3, universal; 4, apostolic. These four notes, marks, or signs, are found in the Roman catholic church. The Roman catholic church then is the true church.

1. Unity is one mark of the true church, and the Roman catholic church is characterised by unity. Unity is one mark of the true church; does not Christ speak of "my church," and does not the utterance imply one and only one church? In the same way Christ teaches that his church is the one kingdom of heaven, of which he is the one sovereign; the one fold, (flock) of which he is the one shepherd.

There can be no doubt that Christ's church is one: it is one in conception—that is in God's thought and design it is one; it is one in reality—that is it comprehends all who have the spirit of Christ (Gal. IV. 6; Rom. VIII. 15), whether they are in this outer world, or in the inner world of the life everlasting, and to whatever visible communion they may have been or may be attached. The spirit of Christ is "faith, hope, and charity" (1 Cor. XIII, 13), without which no one belongs to Christ, and, in consequence, no one belongs to the church of Christ. This spirit of Christ is the christian's vital principle, of which the essence is faith, that is the trusting, loving, and child-like acknowledgement of God in Christ as the creator, governor, and saviour, of the world. This faith, inspiring the true disciples of Jesus with "all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering and mutual forbearance, keeps the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, to the practical and devout recognition of one body and one spirit, one hope, one lord, Jesus Christ, one God and father of all who is above all,

and through all and in all" (Ephes. IV, 2—6); and will continue to work under divine aid till all come in its unity, and in the unity of the knowledge of the Son of God "unto perfect men, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." (12, 13.)

These words show that the church is also one in aim and final issue. God's thought, already in part realised, is continually embodying itself in fact, and will in due time become a universal reality in human life when, all men being saved with the salvation which is in Jesus Christ, God himself will be all in all (I Tim. II, 4; 1 Cor. XV).

This unity of spirit is, however, accompanied by a diversity of form, for God's spirit, working in all its true recipients, bestows diverse gifts, puts forth diverse manifestations, and operates on society by diverse ministries, so as to suit itself to original and acquired diversities in human beings, and impregnating those diversities with its own virtues, make them prolific in its own fruits (1 Cor. XII).

The true unity of Christ's church then is unity in diversity. Consequently the diversity is an element in the unity, and an essential in the genuine Christian life. The unity is in the spirit, the diversity is in the form. One spirit working by diverse organisms is the true unity. Unity in diversity constitutes the body of Christ, that is, the sum total of Christian life as individualised in the separate members, and as aggregated in the great spiritual whole. The body of Christ accordingly is not any visible church, nor all the visible churches in the world, but the collected and united spirits of "just men made perfect," "the church of the first-born whose names are written in

heaven," which in time will become co-extensive with the human race, and be the fulness of Christ even as Christ is the fulness of him who filleth all in all (Rom. X, 11, 12; XI, 12, 26, 32; Ephs. I, 17 seq.; Col. I, 19 seq.). What are termed visible churches are but forms and instruments of the one true church; preparatory schools, in and by which the Head of that church is constantly electing and appropriating to himself living individual members. These communities then are churches properly so called only so far as they contain living individual members, and promote the ingathering into the heavenly fold of all Christ's sheep (John XVII, 19, 20). Unfruitful branches do not really belong to the church, and are liable to be cast forth to wither (John XV, 1 seq.), though they may be borne with till the great day of discrimination. (Matt XIII, 24 seq.) To this form, comprehending fruitful and unfruitful branches (Matt. XIII, 47) belong apostles,—Judas included—prophets, teachers, and other officers, no less than disciples, all of whom are members the one of the other, through whom God carries forward the sanctification of society, dividing to every man severally as he wills. (1 Cor. XII, 11 seq.) In this community there is no priesthood but all are priests (1 Pet. II, 5, 9), and no kingship but all are kings (Rev. V. 10), the highest in function being those who are lowliest in spirit and bearing. (Matt. XX, 25 seq.)

Having set forth the scriptural idea of the one true church we proceed to describe the Roman catholic idea of the one true church. For the purpose I have translated the words of a high Roman catholic authority,* already employed for our instruction. "Christ instituted and founded

* Perrone ; II, 691 seq.

a church in order that in it and by it his worshippers might be furnished with the means for acquiring eternal salvation. The church consists of a soul and a body. All the righteous, and only the righteous, belong to the soul of the church. To the body of the church, or the visible church, belong all the believers in Christ, the righteous as well as the sinful. The body of the church consists of the hierarchy instituted by divine organisation, and of laymen, or it consists of cleres and laics distinguished from each other by divine right. A mutual communion exists between the soul and the body of the church instituted by Christ, by which the church is most certainly apprehended as living and acting in a supernatural manner. The church is both visible and invisible; visible as to its body, invisible as to its soul."

The distinction here taken as between the body and the soul of the church is not grounded in scripture. In consequence it is apt to lead astray. It does lead astray here, for it leads to the placing in the body of the church the sinful as well as the righteous. This inclusion of the sinful is necessary for Romish ideas and practices. Were not the sinful in the church they could not be subjected to church discipline, nor be made to contribute to sacerdotal gain and aggrandisement. Equally were the church recognised as consisting only of the righteous, not only would the bulk of the laity be excluded but no few of the clergy. In consequence the huge organisation which Rome now rules and turns to account would to a very large extent be exempt from her sway; and so Rome would cease to be Rome. The bearing of this notion on the Confessional is marked and decided. But for this notion the Confessional, as a church instrument, would have no

function or but an inconsiderable one. It is because the sinner is a member of the church that he is compelled to enter the Confessional and submit to its discipline.

The inclusion in the church of sinners by name suffices to show how boldly Rome runs in the face of the New Testament; for does not the New Testament ask "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners shall inherit the kingdom of God; and such were some of you; but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified; ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by the spirit of our God" (1 Cor. VI, 9—11; comp. Rev. XXI, 27; XXII, 15). The notion that makes the sinful a constituent element in the church is a corollary of the Romanist doctrine of baptism, which, as a sacrament, makes every baptised person, whatever his character, a member of the church. Here Rome's essential externality comes into view, as if a mind, alien from God by wicked works, could be a member of his son's church—a supposition possible only in one who made the outer man the substance of the real man. The same externality appears in the statement of the end why the church has been founded, namely, with a view to eternal salvation, that is, escape from hell and the attainment of heaven. The true and scriptural purpose of the church is to make men holy like God (Colos. I, 22). The method, too, is external for it is supernatural, that is, sacramental, something done for you and not by you, something done for you by God, by Christ, by the confessor. The true and scriptural method is declared in the words "Work

out your own salvation, for it is God who worketh in you " (Phil. II, 12).

The visible church, as described by Rome, is not the church. Strictly speaking, it is no church at all, but merely the ground-plan of the temple—the scaffolding for the erection of the edifice. It follows that neither the office-bearers nor the disciples in the church are, as such, the church; but solely those of them who, in virtue of vital holiness and active love, are one with Christ, and so one with God. Consequently the Roman hierarchy and laity, considered as such, are not the church any more than the ministers and people of dissenting congregations. This view is confirmed by two terms employed in the Catholic description of the church. It is a Roman church. This connexion with place betrays its unspirituality, and so takes the Roman church out of the category of the church. The Roman church is a hierarchy sundered from the disciples, and so betrays its unscripturalness; for, in scripture, such a distinction is disowned. Besides, a hierarchy is an outward and earthly thing which can have no partnership in or everlasting essence of the one true and invisible church.

In the description of the church which we have borrowed from the Jesuit professor, Perrone, Rome makes the invisible church part and parcel of the true church. In her common teachings, however, she is prone to omit the invisible church, and to narrow the true church to the visible or actual church, and even to restrict it, practically, to the pope and his hierarchical associates. In this work of material limitation she seeks aid by appealing to scripture, as read in her own Latin version. Thus it is an object with her to give prominence to the fold rather than

to the flock, and to make it appear that as there is but one fold, so is their's that one fold. Accordingly the Vulgate gives John X. 16 as it appears in our authorised version, which, under episcopalian prepossessions deserted the Greek, which has a word signifying *flock*; and Tyndale, who employs the word *flock*, to follow the Catholic translation, which instead of flock has fold. I supply the passages which justify these statements, and illustrate the way in which other proof texts have been fabricated on behalf of popular falsities. It may be observed that Wiclif and the Rheims version represent the Vulgate, that Tyndale gives the correct rendering of the Greek original, and that the words specially requiring attention are printed in Italics.

Wicliff, 1380.	Rheims, 1582.	Authorised, 1611.	Tyndale, 1534.
I have other sheep that ben not of this foold, and it behoueth me to bryng hem to gide and thei schulen here my vois, and it shall be made o <i>foold</i> , and o scheepheerd.	And other sheepe I have that are not of this folde; them also I must bring, and they sha'l heare my voice, and there shall be made one <i>folde</i> and one pastor.	And other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one <i>fold</i> and one shepherd.	And other shepe I have which are not of this <i>folde</i> . Them also must I bri ge that that they maye heare my voice, and that there may be one <i>flocke</i> and one shepherde.

The word translated "folde" by Tyndale is rightly so translated. Here the Vulgate and its followers are correct. The word translated "flocke" by Tyndale is rightly so translated. Here the Vulgate and its followers are incorrect, and they are incorrect because they abandon the Greek. It is painful to find king James's translators among those followers.* However, Rome has in the

* See "*A Revised English Bible the Want of the Church and the Demand of the Age, comprising a Critical History of the Authorised Version and Corrections of numerous Mistranlations,*" by John R. Beard, D.D. London: E. T. Whitfield 7s. 6d.; or 5s. if had of the author: p. 349.

passage no real advantage, for it is the flock, and not the fold, that Jesus declared should be one, thus showing that in his mind the thought of unity was fixed on the one spiritual and invisible church, and not on any outward aggregate whatever.

Another text in which Rome has thought to find support to herself is—1 Tim. III, 14, 15—“These things I write unto thee, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar (“a piler,” Wiclif) and ground (“or stay,” Margin) of the truth.” The church here meant is not the Romanist church of pope, cardinals and priests; nor the visible church of Perrone, including the wicked, but “the church of God,” that is, the church which is filled with, and characterised by, the spirit of God; the only church which, possessing the truth, can witness its divinity and power, and so sustain God’s faith in heaven and on earth. (Comp. Ephes. II., 18 seq.; III., 14 seq.)

It is, however, asserted by Romanists, that as there are certain signs or tokens by which the true church may be known, so these signs or tokens belong to the church of Rome, and accordingly determine it to be the true church. In the 4th century, the council of Constantinople made a part of the creed which it sanctioned these words: “I believe in one holy, catholic, and apostolic church;” from that time downward such has been the doctrine of Rome. Hence unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity, are the recognised qualities or characters of the true church. These characters belong to the church of Rome, whence it follows that the church of Rome is the true church.

That the true church is one, holy, catholic, and apostolic, is certain. This has appeared in the description we have

given of the church; these attributes, however, are claimed for Rome. For the sake of argument say they belong to Rome: what logicue is the inference? that Rome is a member of the one true church. This is a very different position from that which Rome takes up, namely: that she is the one true church, that is, the only true church. If then all these attributes are proved to be Rome's, Rome is not thereby justified in her pretensions, unless she can show in addition, that the attributes are not shared by any other community or number of men on earth. The former task, however, is only too difficult; the latter Rome may be excused if she does not undertake. However, let us descend into the arena chosen by Rome herself, and pass in brief review the four tokens of the true church.

1. Its unity proves that the church of Rome is the true church. This unity is described as arising from a unity of belief and communion; the belief is the belief in what Rome teaches; the communion is communion with Rome. By communion with Rome is meant subjection to the pope, and to the confessor as the pope's representative. Rome is here more ingenious than fair; it is easy to substantiate your position, when you are allowed to frame your own proofs.—“No unity without union with Rome, and he that is not in the unity is out of the church, and so out of the pale of salvation.”—But where, except in Romanist books, is it declared, “no unity without union with Rome”? Are these words found in scripture, or any principle or thought whence the sense they convey could be deduced? Certainly not: so outward a test of true religion has no support, whether direct or indirect, in the bible.—The unity of the church comes, and comes only, from union with Christ.

The other alleged character of unity is belief in what Rome teaches. Such a unity, if established as a fact, would serve to demonstrate that Rome is not the true church of Christ; for that church, as made known in the new testament, ignoring creeds and creed religion, places its focus in faith, and by faith denotes not the letter which killeth, but the spirit which giveth life,—not a system of metaphysical doctrine, nor an amalgam of human opinions, but a state of heart, mind, and character,—such a state as sits at Jesus's feet, leans on God, and, in the light and power which hence ensue, goes about doing good.

However, the church of Rome pretends to unity of doctrine. Unity of doctrine—what does the phrase imply? The phrase must for its purpose imply that the church of Rome has always taught the same doctrine, and having always taught the same doctrine is therefore the true church. The argument, if well supported, could convince none but those who had previously admitted that to teach the same doctrine is a proof of the true church. Now this would be to admit that Christian salvation comes from the reception of a certain form of doctrine. If so, then Christianity is a dogma not a power, a form of words and not a divine life. Moreover, the question would arise what form of doctrine? what is the true form of doctrine? does Rome teach the true form of doctrine? Mere unity says only “as it was in the beginning so is it now, and so it ever will be world without end.” Error has unity as well as truth. The allegation, however, is without foundation; Rome has not always taught the same form of doctrine. For the sake of explicitness call the form A, and let A be understood to represent a certain fixed amount. Here is a real unit, an invariable monad, an un-

mistakeable quantity. Well then, Rome taught A when it taught the so called Apostles' creed ; it taught A when it taught the Nicene creed ; it taught A when it taught the pseudo-Athanasian creed ; it taught A when it taught the Tridentine creed ; and it teaches A when it teaches the Tridentine creed plus the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. Five identical forms of doctrine are here under our eyes, each of which is represented by A. This is what Rome's pretension amounts to. But what is such a pretension except an insult to common sense ? These five creeds are five very different quantities, and they establish the disunity of Rome beyond the possibility of question or reply. If A represents the Apostles' creed, then the other creeds as containing more than A contain too much. If A represents the Tridentine creed plus the immaculate conception, then the other creeds contain too little. If A, as representing the Apostles' creed, taught enough for salvation, then why make the additions embodied in the Nicene creed ? But if the additions embodied in the Nicene creed were necessary to salvation, then the Apostles' creed fell short of what was necessary to salvation ; so with the rest. Any way we have here diversities, in number not few, in amount not small, in importance not inconsiderable. Yet Rome has taught them all. Rome then is not the true church, herself being the judge, for her teaching, instead of being always the same, is found on the very surface of her history to have varied greatly from one century to another.

We have compared together the principal creeds or professions of faith acknowledged by Rome. We might continue the enquiry by taking in succession her individual doctrines and usages ; the titles, dignities, and functions of

her officers ; the kind and degree of her religious, social, and political power ; as well as the amount of her annual income, and the extent of her accumulated property. In all these things, that is in all that makes Rome Rome, there has been instead of unity, the greatest diversity ; fluctuations too numerous to be told ; losses all but too heavy to bear, and achievements which almost surpass belief. Amidst all these growths and decays, one thing only has been constant,—and here is the sole unity that belongs to Rome, namely: an insatiable ambition which, inherited from her predecessors, the Cæsars, has made her get all she could and keep all she got ; and so in that matter over which, and over which alone, she has unshared control, namely, articles of belief, points of ceremony and titles of distinction, she has from the first continued to grow, every passing century more bulky and more imposing, but, at the same time, more unlike the lowly and suffering Jesus.

“ Surely however,” it may be said, “ Rome has been so far one as to be exempt from the charge of sanctioning discrepancies, much more contradictions.”

Whether we consider Rome to be represented by councils or by popes, we are compelled by facts to deny the implication. Contradictions abound in her history.

According to the councils of Constantine (A.D. 1414), and Basle (1431), the authority of the church resides in councils ; according to the council of Trent (1545), it resides in the pope. The first council of Nice (325), disallows the baptism which is administered by opponents of the trinity, while the first council of Constantinople (381), allows the baptism which is administered by some heretics, and the council of Trent the baptism which is administered by all heretics.

The first council of Nice, orders the immediate deposition of a priest convicted of unchastity; the council of Trent rejects the punishment for the first crime, commands nothing more than suspension after repeated warnings, and admits deposition only in case of obstinate persistence in the sin. The council of Constance forbids the faithful the wine of the Eucharistic supper, allowing them only the bread, while the council of Basle grants to the Catholics of Bohemia and Moravia the wine as well as the bread. The third Latran council (A.D. 1179), lays it down as a principle that oaths which are contrary to ecclesiastical utility, and, consequently, those made to heretics, are not obligatory: and, following this principle, the Council of Constance declares the safe-conduct granted to Huss null and void. On the contrary, the Council of Trent publishes for all the members of the Confession of Augsburg, and for all Protestants who wish to repair thither to discuss matters of faith, a safe-conduct, in which "all fraud and snares being excluded," it promises in true and good faith not to seek openly or secretly any opportunity against them; nor to call into action, to their prejudice, any law, canon, power, or authority, particularly that of Constance. The first Council of Constantinople makes the Holy Spirit proceed solely from the Father; but the second Council of Lyons, following the example of the Council of Toledo (589), derives the Holy Spirit from the Son as well as the Father. These contrarieties are too clear and marked, and on points, too, obviously of doctrine and morals, to leave to Rome the right of declaring that she has always taught the same doctrine, and so possesses the attribute of unity. In one of these instances, however, she expressly

sets aside not only her own usages, but the example even of Christ himself. To relieve the possibility of doubt, we shall literally translate her words as put forth by the Council of Constance. It is known that in the Communion only the bread is given to the laity, while the priests take both the wine and the bread. It is equally well known that Jesus gave the two to his disciples indiscriminately. The scripture records that the Eucharistic elements were given "after supper;" consequently they were taken by persons who had just eaten. Rome, however, requires the recipients to be fasting when they communicate. The contradictions might be supposed to have grown up insensibly, and to have no other sanction than usage. It is not so; they are the written law of the church. The following is a literal translation of the language employed on the point by the Council of Constance:—

"Although Christ after supper instituted and administered to his disciples this venerable sacrament under the two species of bread and wine, *yet, notwithstanding this*, the audible authority of sacred canons, and the approved custom of the church, has observed, and observes that this sacrament ought not to be celebrated after supper, nor received by the faithful except when fasting; and this custom has been reasonably introduced to avoid some dangers and scandals, namely, that although in the primitive church this sacrament was received by the faithful under both species, yet afterwards by the ministrants under both, and by the laity under only one, the bread, since it is most firmly to be believed and in no way to be doubted, that the whole body and blood of Christ is contained under the species of the bread as under the species of the wine.

Hence, seeing this custom has been reasonably introduced by the church and the holy fathers, and for a very long time observed, it is to be accounted the law, which no one is at liberty to disallow, or, without the authority of the church, to change at his own pleasure."

Here we are presented with contradictions of two kinds as appears thus:—

Rome contradicts Christ.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Christ gave the bread and the wine to all his disciples. | Rome refuses the wine to the laity. |
| 2. Christ gave the bread and the wine after supper. | Rome refuses them, except to such as are fasting. |

Rome contradicts herself.

The primitive church gave the bread and the wine to the laity.	The present church withholds the wine from the laity.
--	---

To the same effect history shows us one Pope contradicting another. Hormisdas (A.D. 514) declared that no one of the persons of the trinity suffered in the flesh; but John II (533) asserted that the second person suffered in the flesh. Gregory the Great (590) declared that no one of his predecessors took the title of universal bishop, and condemned all pretensions to the name; but his second successor, Boniface III (607) caused it to be given to himself by the emperor Phocas; while Gregory VII (1073) with the aid of a council held in Rome (1075), made the title pope (*father*) his own exclusively, though of old it was given to every bishop. Pascal II (1099) and Eugenius III (1145) authorized duelling; but Julius II (1503) and Pius IV (1559) forbade the practice. Adrian II (867) declared the presence of a priest at a marriage not necessary to its legitimacy; but Pius VII (1800) asserted that there is no

marriage without a priest. Sixtus V (1585) published a translation of the Bible in Italian, and recommended the reading of it in a Bull; Pius VI (1775) addressed a very flattering letter to Martini, who published another translation; but Pius VII (1800) confirmed the decree of the Congregation of the Index, which condemned the Italian Bible, and in general interdicted all the versions of the Scriptures in modern languages. Paul III (1503) established the Order of the Jesuits; Clement IV (1769) dissolved it; by Pius VII (1800) it was restored. The same Pope is known to have contradicted himself. Zozimus (417) first confirmed the sentence of his predecessor Innocent I (402), against Pelagius and Celestius, then revoked the condemnation, and finally declared the former in the wrong. Vigilius (539) favoured the heresy of the monophysites, to gain the papal crown; then supported and then anathematized the heresy; then gave equivocal oracles on the subject, and ended by agreeing with the second Council of Constantinople, by which it was formally condemned (553). Pascal II (1099) concluded with Henry V a concordat, permitting bishops and abbots to receive investiture from that emperor; but in 1112 retracted the permission by a Bull. John XXII first asserted and then denied that the souls of the just see God face to face, and are perfectly happy before the day of judgment. The Council of Basle permitted an appeal from the Pope to a future Council; Pius II (1458) and Julius II (1503) interdicted such an appeal.

On one point Rome is very express and emphatic in her statements. Her unity is proved by the succession of her pontiffs, and by the continuance at Rome of the chair of St. Peter, so that Pius IX is the heir of the apostle in the

direct line, and rules in the same city in which the apostle ruled. Of Peter's connexion with Rome we have already spoken ; here we deal with the alleged succession, not the origin, of the Roman bishops. Now, it is very easy to say that Pio Nono occupies the chair of St. Peter, and the ignorant may be hence led to suppose that Peter's chair had always remained at Rome, and been taken by Pope after Pope in one unbroken line from the first century down to the nineteenth. But the triumph thus gained is too facile to be sure. The unbroken succession is a fiction, whether the place or the men are concerned. A list of thirty-eight anti-popes, as they are called, lies before me, drawn up under the eyes of Gregory XVI. This means that thirty-eight persons claimed to be, in each case, the Pope, instead of a rival some way or other more successful than himself. Not only was the claim made but the title given, the office assumed, the power exercised. Material and temporal and political causes made A anti-pope and B pope to-day, while to-morrow B was anti-pope and A pope. Singular unity here! one pope contending against another, and gaining the advantage by the force of guile or force of arms! curious, too, the transmission of the episcopal unction through these rivalries and faction fights! The sword, rather than the crosier, is the proper emblem of the bishopric of Rome. Rome, however, was once abandoned by the popes : in 1309 Pope Clement V transferred the chair of St. Peter to Avignon, in France, and his successors continued to reside there until 1377. During all these years the popes were under the influence of the kings of France, who, by getting the papacy into their own territories, hoped to wield thereby a weapon deadly to the influence, too long dominant with the holy fathers, of the

emperors of Germany. In 1377 Gregory XI returned to Rome. At the death of that pope there broke out the great schism, which lasted for seventy years (1378-1448), during which Christendom beheld the edifying sight of two series of infallible shepherds of Christ's flock ruling simultaneously, the one residing at Rome, the other at Avignon or elsewhere, and both busy in hurling anathemas at each other. So much for papal unity, and for papal unity as one sign of the true church! If this is unity what is discord? Yet this is not all. Not once or twice, but repeatedly, there have been two or more rival popes at the same time. Accordingly the word Anti-pope is very familiar to the historical student. As early as 251 (A.D.) the question arose which of two is *the* Pope? In the year 366 there were at the same time two popes; in the year 498 there were at the same time two popes; in the year 685 there were at the same time three popes; in the year 687 there were at the same time three popes; in the year 757 there were at the same time four popes; in the year 768 there were at the same time two popes; in the year 824 there were at the same time two popes; in the year 855 there were at the same time two popes; in the year 891 there were at the same time two popes; in the year 972 there were at the same time two popes; in the year 996 there were at the same time two popes; in the year 1012 there were at the same time two popes; in the years 1033-48 there were at the same time three popes; in the year 1057 there were at the same time two popes; in the year 1061 there were at the same time two popes; in the year 1080 there were at the same time two popes; in the year 1099 there were at the same time three popes; in the year 1118 there were at the same time two popes; in the year 1124

there were at the same time two popes ; in the year 1130 there were at the same time three popes ; in the year 1159 there were at the same time five popes ;—but enough, and for the papal argument, much more than enough. With which of these numerous pairs of popes was the truth ? Out of this batch of three, or that batch of four, or again, that batch of five popes, which was the real successor of St. Peter ? And did that succession vary with the fortune of war or the hand of the assassin ? John XII was dethroned by a council on an accusation of all kinds of sacrilege. Being so deposed, did he lose his right ? Leo VIII was elected as his successor ; was Leo VIII the man of God's choice ? Who then enjoyed that honour when the deposed John forced his way back to the seat of St. Peter, and committed acts of frightful vengeance ? When Boniface VII (974) murdered his two competitors, Benedict VI and John XIV in order to seize the tiara, was God's favour with the assassin or the assassinated ? Not many centuries since, there were also two chairs, both alike infallible, yet hurling thunderbolts the one at the other. Was God's tabernacle at Avignon or at Rome ? For a period of seventy years was the unity of the church broken in twain—with these or those, with which series was the genuine infallibility ? The Roman popes at last prevailed ; therefore, argue the papists, the Roman popes were the favourites of Heaven. It has been said that poverty is the greatest fault a man can have. We may now add that failure and logical pravity are identical. But then, how the scales go up and down with the popes of Rome ! when prosperous, they are of God ; when in adversity, they are under God's condemnation. Now is the papacy true, and now is it untrue ; now is it the way to heaven, and now is it the high

road to hell. Had the papacy been always prosperous, the argument might have been safe, though not then would it have been sound. In the actual circumstances the defence is suicidal.

Historical documents and present facts are indeed only too numerous to prove that all the variations of human thought photograph themselves on the mirror of the church, as they inevitably arise from generation to generation, and under the diverse endowments with which God sends individuals into the world. Bossuet thought to gain an irreversible triumph over Protestantism by displaying its variations. The argument wounds the hand that deals the blow. Romanism has variations no fewer in number, no less in amount.* What is Jansenism but Calvinism in a Roman garb? What is Jesuitism but Arminianism and Methodism, with something far worse than both? The successive philosophies of Germany have been, and are, taught from Romanist chairs, and nearly all its shades of theology find representatives in Romanist professors. The old factions of more pope, or less pope, or something above the pope, be it the councils, the church, or the Society of Jesus, still prolong their existence, and ever and anon put forth their power. Here the hierarchy has merely spiritual functions; there its prerogatives, extending over minds, extend in consequence over states and sovereigns of states. Rival parties and diverging direction of thought give birth to diverse organs; and the press here whispers moderation, and there thunders for coercion. Bound together in a formal unity, the several kingdoms and empires have each their own church differing in spirit and tendencies more than they agree exteriorly; so that Catholicism in France is

* See "The Variations of Popery," by Samuel Edgar.

one thing, that of Belgium another, that of Piedmont again another, and that of Spain still another.

These diversities sometimes give rise to ridiculous difficulties. The trump of the archangel cannot "blow hot and cold," and so when the direct sanction of heaven is pleaded, it is necessary that the sanction should be uniform. A discrepancy has lately been made manifest. Rome pretends to retain the supernatural within her borders.—Accordingly, ever and anon miracles are proclaimed, and of course believed. These miracles, however, are sometimes found to run over each other. Mary of Agreda, a Spanish extatic, has had revelations. Catherine Emmerich, a German extatic, has also had revelations. These revelations have been welcomed, and assumed in the eyes of the faithful a sanctity like those of the children of Salette, and of the young Bernadette de Lourdes. Nay, the revelations have a special mission, namely to win men back from the errors of rationalism. Unfortunately, however, the two disagree. The Spaniard assigns only one daughter to Saint Ann, mother of the Virgin; the German gives her three. The Spaniard makes Saint Ann die before the marriage of Mary and Joseph; the German makes Saint Ann live until the birth of Jesus. The Spaniard places the death of Mary at Jerusalem; the German places it at Ephesus. Which is right? Yet both are divinely inspired—say Romanist authorities. We may rest assured, however, that the one deserves reliance as much as the other, contradict each other though they do.*

The second character, or proof, of the one true church, is its holiness. The Church of Christ is described in scripture as "a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle

* *"Le Lien,"* fourth series, vol. iii. No. 52.

or any such thing, holy and without blemish (Ephes. V., 27). The Roman church is holy: *ergo*, the Roman church is the Church of Christ, the one true church. Doubtless, if "the Roman church is holy;" that is emphatically and pre-eminently holy. The holiness intended in scripture is practical holiness—a holy life issuing from a holy heart. Is Rome holy, preferably holy, in this sense? The question is not whether there are holy men and women in the Roman church, but whether these holy men and women exist in such numbers, and in such position, as to enjoy the prerogative of stamping their name on the church at large. Nor must we restrict our thoughts to the Roman church as it is at the present day. Avowedly the church is eighteen centuries old. The whole of its existence must be surveyed if its real character is to be ascertained. And if this is too large a task for our space, we must, at least, be at liberty to refer to the past when necessary.

The definition given of the church as including wicked men, a definition necessarily involved in every conception of the church as outward and visible, would of itself suffice to give a negative to Rome's claim of sanctity. From terms employed by Rome herself it is evident that a community, one of whose component parts is sinful, cannot, as a whole, be pronounced holy. The sinful members of the church had become so numerous in the days of Luther as to raise an irresistible demand for Reform, on the all but universally admitted allegation that "in head, body, and members" the church had become corrupt. If any portion of the whole may be taken as representing the church that portion is the head. Now, it is of flagrant notoriety, that some of the worst men that ever lived sat in what is called "the chair of St. Peter." Roman advocates, whose busi-

ness it was to defend their church against Protestants, have admitted the fact substantially. The following are the words of Perrone* :—" We do not conceal the fact that there have been popes who, through the calamity of their times, yielded to human infirmity, especially of those who, by the power of factions, forced their way into the chair of St. Peter. The same may be said of bishops and priests." Not so mild are the terms employed by another distinguished Romanist, namely the Cardinal Baronius,† who in speaking about Stephen VII, exclaims " O shame ! O grief ! how many horrible monsters have intruded into the apostolic see ! what evils have they not committed ! of what tragedies have they not been the authors ! what ordure have they not cast on the spotless bride of Christ ! with what disgusting odours have they not infected her ! Have they not indeed covered her with an infamy that will never come to an end ? This century has been mournful and deadly to the Roman church, because all those were asleep whose duty it was to watch, and because they even tried every means to sink the apostolic bark. How hideous was the face of the holy Roman church during the domination of the most infamous Courtesans, who disposed of pulpits at their pleasure, who made bishops, and, what is more horrible and wicked, who put their paramours into St. Peter's chair." The frightful statement is confirmed by Genebrard,‡ archbishop of Aix : " There were," he says, " during one century-and-a-half fifty popes so disorderly that they deserve the name of apostates rather than that of apostolics." Cardinal Bellarmin makes of an epoch

* *Prælectiones Theologicæ* II, 795.

† *Ann.* 808, 899, 900, 972.

‡ *Génebrard, Chron. ad Ann.*, 991.

much less distant, a declaration equally overwhelming: "Some years before the heresies of Luther and Calvin there was, according to contemporary authors, neither justice in the ecclesiastical tribunals, nor discipline in the morals of the clergy, nor knowledge of sacred things, nor respect for things divine—in a word, scarcely was there any religion left."* Pope Adrian VI (1522) expressed himself, in his instructions to the nuncio Cheregoti, whom he sent to the diet of Nurnberg, as follows: "We know that for now a long while abominable excesses have gathered around the holy see—abuses in spiritual things; transgression of powers; everything has been vitiated. The corruption has spread from the head to the members; from the pope to the prelates; we have all turned from the right way;—there is not one who has done good, not even a single one."† Among abandoned popes, I translate a Catholic account of one, "Alexander VI, or Roderic Borgia, born in 1431, at Valentia in Spain, who caused himself to be named pope in 1492, after having bought the votes of several cardinals. Dissipated in his youth, he had, by a Roman lady named Vanozza, four sons, the most known of whom is Cæsar Borgia, afterwards a cardinal, and one daughter, the too notorious Lucretia Borgia. This pope plays a very important part in the political history of his times. After carrying on an unsuccessful war against Charles VIII, king of France, he entered into a close alliance with Louis XII, and with the aid of that alliance, succeeded in augmenting the temporal power of the holy see. To satisfy his ambition and his lust, to raise the princes of his family, he trampled under foot all laws

* Bellarmi, Concio XXVIII; opp. t. VI.

† Rainald, t. XI, p. 363; see Ranke's History of the Popes.

whether human or divine, and did not fear to have recourse to perfidy and, perhaps, to poison. He died in 1503, poisoned, it is said, by taking a beverage prepared for one of his victims.* Even the best intentioned popes found themselves surrounded by abuses, corruptions, hindrances, and active resistance, which made them powerless. In the dawn of the Reformation there were at Rome 2150 venal offices, the property of church dignatories, the revenues of which were immense. These offices were created by batches: to-day, twenty-five secretaries, to-morrow, forty keepers of the archives; and all these creatures acquired the right of living at the cost of Christendom. "Yes, dear Leo," wrote Luther in 1520, "you seem to me like Daniel in the lions' den, like Ezekiel among the scorpions; what couldst thou do alone against all these monsters? Let us add three or four learned and virtuous cardinals;—if with these you dare to apply a remedy to such a heap of abuses, would you not be poisoned? O unhappy Leo, who sittest on that accursed throne! If Saint Bernard took pity on his pope, Eugenius, what shall not be our lamentations over thee when corruption has had four hundred more years to grow in? Yes, you would have to thank me for thy salvation should I succeed in breaking open that dungeon, that hell wherein thou art." Leo X did not find his dungeon so much amiss; he embellished it as much as possible by magnificence, by festivities, by farces. To meet the cost of those farces he had himself created more than one thousand of those venal offices we spoke of but

* Dictionnaire Universal d'Hist., &c., Paris, 1847.—Those who wish to study the character of the sovereign pontiffs are referred to "Les Crimes des Popes," par Lavicomterie, Paris, 1792; and "Portraits Politiques des Popes," par Llorente, Paris, 1822.

now.* The account which Bishop Burnett† gives of Scotland may be taken as a true general description:—"The clergy of Scotland were both very ignorant and dissolute in their manners. The secular clergy minded nothing but their titles, and did either hire some friars to preach, or some poor priests to sing, masses to them at their churches. The abbots had possessed themselves of the best seats and the greatest wealth of the nation; and by a profuse superstition, almost the one half of the kingdom fell into the hands of the churchmen. The bishops looked more after affairs of the state than the concerns of the church; and were resolved to maintain by their cruelty what their predecessors had acquired by fraud and impostures. And, as Lesly himself confirms, there was no pains taken to instruct the people in the principles of religion; nor were the children at all catechised, but left in ignorance; and the ill lives of the clergy, who were both covetous and lewd, disposed the people to suffer those who preached for a reformation."

When claiming sanctity for their church, Romanists have specially in view the clergy. Are, then, the clergy of the Roman church holy?—*emphatically* holy?—holy in such a sense as to demonstrate the divine authority of the church to which they belong? The external holiness which episcopal ordination conveys counts for nothing here. The argument requires holiness which is recognised, not in ecclesiastical courts, but the court of heaven. Unless the priests are holy, as God is holy they are not God's servants. But holy in the proper sense they cannot be; for they are unmarried; and, as a class with whom bachelorship is

* "Histoire du Concile de Trente," par F. Bungener, 2nd edit., I, 8.

† "History of the Reform of the Church of England," I, 305.

an indispensable obligation, they are in opposition to God's laws, and so cannot be holy before God. On the contrary, their vow of what they call chastity is the source of all the uncleanness of thought that distinguishes and degrades the Confessional. Viewing the Romanist clergy as a class of compelled bachelors, and viewing them in their personal conduct and professional practices, we have no alternative but to refuse them the epithet holy, and fear they stand among those of our race who are least chaste of heart and pure of life. The penitentiaries of Rome suffice of themselves to show the moral corruption which in all ages has prevailed among her clergy. The nature of the details forbids transcription. The following, however, may be read without a blush. It is a part of a description given by Chrysostom of the moral condition of the clergy in his own day—the fourth century:—

“The bishop charged with the solemn duties of his office is thrown into the middle of an ocean where the winds and the tempests war against him every moment, and his course is beset with rocks. The first, the most dangerous, is that of vain-glory—a rock far more deadly than that of the Syrens, of which the fable speaks. There may be mariners happy enough to escape the rock; but to impose the burden of the episcopate on me, such as I am, would be to tie my hands behind my back, and surrender me without defence to the attack of devouring dogs, who have there their dwelling-place; I mean wrath or dejection, envy, hatred, the attacks either of slander or calumny, cheateries, false virtues, open vices, aversions without cause, secret joys over faults of those of our colleagues whom we do not like, vexations and jealousies at the success and the talents of others, the inordinate love of praise, the

desire to be noticed—one of the passions which act most forcibly on the heart of man to corrupt it; in the pulpit the aim is to please, by no means to instruct, the discourses are servile adulations or interested complaisances; the poor are despised, the rich receive incense; homage is lavished on those by whom it is least deserved; wrongful distributions of rewards and favours, as baneful to those who give as to those who receive them; pusillanimous fears, unworthy of the most abject slaves; lack of liberty of speech; oblivion of the rights of the sacred ministry; outwardly the mask of modesty, the reality whereof nowhere; no courage to rebuke vice; all fire against the humble and the weak, but all ice in presence of the great. Such are—and I have not said all—the monsters which the sacred ministry meets with at the bottom of that rock. Once dragged away by the current, you become its prey; you are choked by bonds which you cannot break—deplorable slavery which leads to the most disgraceful humiliations. Women seize power; what is not done to please them? In vain do the oracles of the divine law forbid them the functions reserved for the priesthood; they will domineer. Everything must be subjected to them; and what they cannot effect themselves they obtain by their agents. You see even bishops enchained to their caprices; it is they who at their pleasure place and displace bishops. What happens? Everything is disorder and confusion. Those who ought to command know only how to obey. Oh, that at least one had to bewail only the usurpations on the part of men! But the height of this scandal is that women bear rule in the sanctuary; those reign there whom the apostle did not permit to speak there; and the excess goes so far as to engulph bishops, and to speak to them with greater hauteur than

masters to their slaves. I do not put the entire episcopate on its trial, There are many of its members who have preserved the noble independence of the sacred ministry, nay the greater number. But tell me whence in reality comes so many troubles into our churches? For myself I see no other source than the want of care in episcopal elections. The head must be very strong if it is to correct the influence of the depraved humours which rise from the lower members. A bishop ought never to have the desire of being a bishop. The moment the spark is kindled a devouring fire is inevitable. You must have seen churches profaned by murder and carnage; cities, set in flames, become the theatre of the most violent seditions, fomented by the bishops. But let us throw the veil over those horrors."

Indeed, principles and practices espoused and followed by Rome and her adherents are not only not holy, but immoral, in their nature and effects. It is a principle of the canon law that the Roman pontiff is to be considered as having in the repository of his breast all rights and laws.* If the pope has in his breast all rights and laws, laws and rights depend on his will. Eternal laws of right and wrong then there are none. What the pope declares right is right, though all the world aver it to be wrong; equally what the pope declares wrong is wrong, though all the world aver it to be right. And when a human being makes his own right and his own wrong absolutely, he must cease to be human, or infallibly he will confound the two, and seek his own ends in such a spirit as to make them bad no less than baneful.

More glaringly immoral is the following.

* Scavini *Theologia Moralis Universa*; Bruxellis, 1848, ii. 407.

The canon law distinctly declares that necessity makes lawful that which is not lawful by law.* Who is to be the judge of the necessity? Of course he who is under its pressures. What then I deem necessity makes lawful in me that which is not lawful by law. To steal is necessary ; therefore to steal is lawful. So is it lawful to lie, to cheat, to break a promise, or even to break an oath. Indeed Rome is very lax touching oaths. Scavini makes the following propositions and statements in regard to oaths:—†

“ Oaths are to be interpreted in favour of those by whom they are taken.

Hence this condition, *if I shall be able*, is involved in an oath : also this limitation, *the rights of my superiors being reserved*. Accordingly the confessor may relax oaths which are not in favour of a third party.

It is lawful, for a just reason, to use equivocation in taking an oath : firstly, when a word has a double and altogether diverse sense ; secondly, when a statement has a double sense ; thirdly, when words have a double sense, the one more common, the other less, or the one literal, the other spiritual ; for then we do not deceive our neighbour, but allow him to deceive himself.‡ For we are not bound, just cause existing to the contrary, to speak according to the mind of others ; and a just cause is any honest purpose of preserving goods which benefit our body or mind, or of liberating ourselves from troublesome, unjust, or prying questions. For a just and reasonable cause it is altogether proper to use such limitations in an oath, as an act purely

* Scavini, ii. 409.

† Scavini, ii. 69 and 109.

‡ Tunc enim non decipimus proximum nostrum, sed permittimus ut decipiat ipse se.

mental. This we prove by the example of Christ himself. Did he not use restrictions of this nature when, being asked if he was going up to the festival, he replied, 'I go not up to this festival,' having in his mind this restriction, 'openly and manifestly,' as is involved in the question? Also, when asked respecting the day of judgment, he replied, 'Of that day no one knows, not even the Son of Man,' having in his mind the restriction, *to make it manifest*, as his disciples wished? The same is the teaching of Augustin and Thomas Aquinas. The first says, 'Though every one who lies wishes to conceal what is true, it does not follow that he who wishes to conceal the truth lies; for it is one thing to keep the truth back, and another to put forward a falsehood.' It is not lawful to tell a lie that you may deliver another from peril; but it is lawful, as Augustin says, to conceal the truth prudently, under some dissimulation. The same is established by natural reason; for if for a good reason you may not use such a limitation, there is no method of honestly concealing a secret which a person could not divulge without injury or inconvenience; but this would be not less pernicious to society than a lie. If then it is good to use such a limitation, nothing hinders but that you may confirm it with an oath as often as circumstances require. Nevertheless it is not to be denied that a greater reason is required for equivocating with an oath, because an appeal to God is not to be made too readily. Moreover, we will illustrate the alleged principle by some examples. 1. A confessor may declare, under the sanction of an oath, that he does not know a sin learnt by him while hearing a confession, meaning that he did not know it *as a man*, for a questioner has no right except to have knowledge that is *communicable*; but things made

known in confession are not communicable. 2. An accused person or witness, being questioned by a judge, not legitimately, may swear he does not know the crime, meaning he does not know the crime respecting which a *legitimate enquiry is made*. 3. He who comes from a place erroneously thought to be infected with a contagious disease, may deny that he comes from that place, that is, *as infected with a contagious disease*, as is the thought of the interrogator. 4. A person invited to your table, and being asked if the food is good, may declare that it is good, though in truth it is tasteless, meaning that it is good for *penance and mortification*; he who has been compelled into a marriage may assert he has not contracted a marriage, that is, *freely*."

These extracts suffice of themselves to take from Rome the right to claim special holiness. That right is nullified most signally by the Confessional. The essentially immoral and corrupting tendencies of the Confessional are spoken of elsewhere. Here it is enough to translate what follows from authoritative instructions prepared for confessors, in order to show that the Confessional perverts and defiles the confessor no less than the penitent.

"The first use which the confessor should make of his skill is to discover all the evil adroitly. In spiritual infirmities what has chiefly to be feared is, that the afflicted would not disclose their disease with sincerity. On one side nature opposes this strongly, on the other Satan employs a thousand artifices in order to augment the difficulty of an avowal. Therefore, the confessor must give the penitent a cordial reception, and avoid everything which may make him hesitate. With this view he must appear not to recognize him, though he may know who he is. He must also employ his skill so as to learn what he does not

say from what he does say; what the penitent begins the confessor must lead him to complete, and from guilty ignorance or total denial on the penitent's part the confessor must extract explicit and positive information. And because in the matter of impurity all are subject to temptations, and it costs a person more to accuse himself of these faults than of others, if a person comes to a confessor and says nothing on these points, and yet circumstances give reason to suspect a criminal silence,—for example, if the penitent is young, badly brought up, if he prays little, if he rarely frequents the sacraments, if he is surrounded by dangers, then let the confessor question him, always suspecting more evil, and open the way before him in speaking thus—‘You have heard bad language, and have had bad thoughts, have you not? If he says ‘no,’ the confessor must take his ‘no’ for ‘yes,’ and then proceeding with his examination, say to him twice or thrice ‘You dwell with pleasure on those thoughts? Though the answer may be ‘no,’ the confessor must continue, ‘Do not be troubled, do not be discouraged, even though you have consented to this; did you often do so? and besides, from bad thoughts you passed to a bad action, did you not? The penitent surprised to see the confessor has divined the truth, will say in a low voice, ‘yes father.’ If you see that they have difficulty in accusing themselves of disgraceful sins, begin by questioning them on trifling matters, as if you took pleasure in hearing persons speak of shameful things, in having yourself bad thoughts of the kind, and thus going, little by little, from one thing to another, that is to say, from hearing to thinking, from sensual thoughts to sensual acts, lead them on to go constantly deeper, saying, ‘How happy you are to have a kind

confessor, be assured that God accords you a singular favour. I know that the Holy Spirit touches your heart to induce you to make a good confession ; be courageous, my child, and name your sins boldly, and give yourself no trouble about it.' ”*

These last words exemplify the guilty readiness with which confessors, if they follow the instructions given them by their superiors, encourage peace and security in the minds of their penitents. How often, during our studies on this point, has the feeling risen in our mind that the Confessional might be designated “*The Art of Sinning Made Easy.*” We subjoin one out of many instances :—

“ When you meet with persons who are much distressed and alarmed on account of the flagrant sins they have committed, such as sorceries, commerce with demons, bestialities, massacres, &c., employ all your resources to relieve and console them, assuring them of the great pity of God, who is infinitely greater to pardon them than all the sins in the world to damn them, and promise to assist them in all they may need from you for the salvation of their souls.”†

The Church of Rome puts forward another demonstration of its divine origin in its catholicity. Such is the allegation. A bolder position was never taken. In ages when the more distant parts of the earth were unknown, and before free thought had begotten existing diversities, the allegation, then for the first time advanced, had, with the unreflecting, some show of reason ; at present its emptiness appears on the least attention.

The allegation contains an argument which may be

* *Gaume* ; Manuel des Confesseurs, p. 30.

† *Gaume* ; Manuel, Articles II & III.

stated thus :—That religion is divine and true which is universal. The argument is destructive of the claims of Rome. There is no religion that is universal. Religions are very numerous.* There is indeed a sense in which religion is universal. But the religion that is universal is not the form of religion held by Rome, nor any other form of religion. The one universal religion is recognition of unseen superior power. As participating in that universal acknowledgment, Rome has in her a universal element. But this only makes her religion one among many forms of religion, while the existence of those forms disproves her claims. If the true religion is that which is universal, then Rome's religion is not true, for Rome's religion is Rome's religion and not man's ; it belongs, we mean, to a part of the human race, and not the whole.

Rome, however, tries to evade the issue by the use of the word Catholic. But Catholic is only the Greek term corresponding to the Latin (or English) term universal. And it is universality that Rome claims in employing the attributive Catholic. The claim, however, has no support in fact. That Rome aims at universality is undoubted, but the aim itself shows that the end is not yet reached. Nor can the aim ever be reached unless by a spirit of universality. Such a spirit is incompatible with any church which makes salvation depend on opinion. A universal church can be built only on a universal foundation ; and the only foundation which is, or can be, universal, is to be looked for in man's great instinctive affections, as embodied, perfected and imaged forth in Christ. However, universal Rome is not either in form or in spirit ; not in form, because she occupies but one portion of the ground ; not in spirit, because she identifies

religion with her own form of opinion about religion. As to form, what does she declare her own numbers to be? 180,000,000. The eminent geographer, Balbi, fixes the sum total of Romanists at 180,000,000. The addition of 50,000,000—that is on Balbi's reckoning—the addition of above one-third is not inconsiderable; but, to avoid dispute, we take the Romanist estimate. Compare that estimate with the 800,000,000 computed to be the number of the inhabitants of the globe, and say whether the Roman church is universal. To restrict our remarks to Christendom. Perrone* gives these as the numbers of “the heretics,” *i. e.*, non-Romanists, namely:—

Greeks and other Orientals	41,000,000
Protestants	57,000,000
	<hr/>
	98,000,000

He thus makes it appear that Rome has twice as many members as all other Christian churches combined. What then? Can that prove Rome's universality? Put together

Romanists and other Christian Sects.

Romanists	180,000,000
Other Christian Sects	98,000,000
	<hr/>
	278,000,000

Here, then, it appears that out of three parts, Rome has but two; but two-thirds of a whole are not *the whole*. Balbi, however, states the number of Protestants and other Christian sects to be 120,000,000, and so brings them very near to the Romanists, whom he gives as 130,000,000. If this impartial authority is to be followed, the church of Rome can claim as her own little more

* Praellect. Theol. II, 780.

than one-half of the Christian world. This superiority would be greatly reduced by another consideration. The numbers given are the numbers of the population of the different so-called Catholic or Protestant countries; but of these, how many are truly Christian? Nominal professors abound everywhere, but in no region so much as in Romanist lands. A moiety of Rome's 180,000,000 are males, and the males of Catholic countries are for the most part notoriously sceptics—thanks to the corruptions of the *soi-disant* one true church.

The last decisive mark of the true church is apostolicity—"the one, holy, Catholic, and apostolic church." Such is Rome's own description of herself. The three previous notes have been investigated, and found to be not genuine. What of the claim of apostolicity? The argument is that the Church of Rome was founded by Peter, and is consequently apostolic. Peter's claim to be the founder of the Church of Rome receives due consideration elsewhere. The verdict we leave to the reader. Here, however, we allow the claim. What ensues? That the Church of Rome is apostolic to the exclusion of other churches? This is what Rome wants, but this does not follow from the premises. Other churches were founded by other apostles, and so may on that ground be called apostolic equally with Rome. In one sense, all churches had apostles for their founders, since the churches that are come from churches founded by apostles. All existing churches then are apostolic. What does Rome gain by this, her fourth token of the one only true church? A proverb declares "Handsome is that handsome does;" so we say, "Apostolicity is known by its being apostolic." Now, what is really apostolic appears in well defined cha-

racters in the Scriptures, but they are characters totally the opposite to those which belong to Rome. In doctrine and in spirit Rome is the very antithesis of the New Testament. The fact is in itself so patent, and comes into view so often in these pages, that its formal exhibition here would be superfluous.

The four marks of unity, sanctity, universality and apostolicity, by which Rome claims to establish her divinely-authorized and sole dominion, ought to be found in their perfect state in the popes, her supreme heads and acknowledged representatives. It is no unfair proceeding to enquire whether these tokens of God's presence and favour are found in the occupants of the alleged chair of Saint Peter. The question admits of an answer no less ready than decisive. I have before me a carefully drawn up and impartial list of the popes of Rome*, from A.D. 42 to A.D. 1846, extending, that is, from Peter to Mastei Ferretti, the present sovereign of Rome. Appended to many of the names are characteristic remarks. Some of these remarks are of a favourable kind: thus to the praise of Leo II. (A.D. 682), it is said, "he instituted holy water." Many are the reverse, while very many names are left in their native obscurity. I shall conduct the reader down the list, giving him the substance of the inculpatory observations, and then leave him to determine whether the four tests establish or destroy Romanism. I have said, "the inculpatory observations," because, in the issue here joined, the dark side of the papacy invalidates the argument adduced by its defenders in favour of its divinity. One crime suffices to disprove the *alleged holiness of the wearers of the tiara*. The list begins

* See Haydn's "Book of Dignities," 1851, p. 64 seq.

with a doubt. The doubt is whether St. Peter or St. Clement was the first pope. The doubt is extended to St. Linus, who stands number three, but who is set down "in nearly all accounts, as the immediate successor of St. Peter. In the first century of the Christian church, neither the dates of succession nor the succession of popes are reconciled even by the best authorities." A curious basis for infallibility to rest upon! In 222, the chair is vacant. Vacant also is it in 250, in 258, in 304, in 573, in 639, in 683, in 1054, in 1085, in 1241, in 1268, in 1292, in 1304, in 1314; fourteen times, at least, was the Christian world without an infallible head; that is, for not less than twenty years had the Holy Ghost no channel of direct communication with the earth; and yet the sun rose and set, and all things kept their ordinary course. If the world managed to get on during these vacancies, the popes can, after all, hardly be so indispensably requisite. Taking the peculiarities in the order of their appearance, I find next the entry "Antipope," so that it seems that occasionally there was more than one claimant of infallibility. The fact is the more noticeable because "the true king" was determined "by force of arms," though Jesus said, "*All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.*" (Matt. XXVI, 52.) The first antipope on the list is Novatianus, who appears in 252; so early did the lust of power desecrate the holy(?) see. Having, in another place, spoken of the antipopes, I need not now do more than call attention to the fact. Several popes, *e. g.*, Sextus III. (A.D. 432), have what Romanists consider the high merit connected with their name of having "suppressed heretics;" but here is one (Anastasius 398), who "caused the work of Origen to be

proscribed"—Origen, one of the sons of the infallible mother—one of the pillars of the immoveable church! By looking on the names of Boniface 1 (A.D. 418) and Felix III. (A.D. 483), I learn that to have a violent dispute with the emperors (or the secular authority) was the way to get canonized, or made into a demigod. In A.D. 514, there reigned Pope Hormisdas, "who had been married before entering into the ecclesiastical state," and his son, Silverius, ascended the throne in 536—awkward facts in the history of an infallible church which maintains the celibacy of the clergy as an essential point of faith and morals! In 555, the manners of the clergy were so bad that Pelagius I. stands in history celebrated for attempting to effect a reformation of them. What a holy church! Of Stephen IV. (A.D. 752), it is recorded, "With this pope commenced the temporal power of the church of Rome." Seven centuries is a long way from Peter, and Peter's dominion was only first a fishing punt, and then a prison. In 772 reigned Adrian I., who "sanctioned images, in which he was opposed by the kings of England and France"—a strange example of unity! Still stranger is the next statement considered as made of the sole representative of Him who said, "They who take the sword shall perish with the sword,"—the statement affixed to the name of Leo IV. (847), "he defeated the saracens." But what shall we say in regard to Pope Formosus (891), who is here declared to have "died de-tested; his corpse was thrown into the river Tiber"—"the good shepherd!" Leo. V. (903) can scarcely have been much less evil, for he was "driven from his seat a few months after his election, and died in prison." But Singius III. (904) was a monster, who "disgraced his

dignity by his vices :” yet Romanists have the face to put forward “sanctity” as one of the characteristics of their church. We may as well here bring together the blackening terms set against various other popes in this list. We shall transcribe literally :—“939, Stephen VIII., of ferocious character ;” “956, John XII., called the infamous, deposed for adultery and cruelty, and in the end murdered ;” “1033, Benedict IX. became pope by purchase at twelve years of age ;” “1061, Alexander II., he carried the papal power to a height it had not reached before ;” “1073, Gregory VII., the celebrated Hildebrand, remarkable for the unexampled powers he usurped, and his unprincipled career ;” “1088, Urban II., in this pontificate, commenced the great crusade ;” “1159, Alexander III., avenger of the murder of Thomas à Becket ;” “1198, Innocent III. (Lothario Conti), excommunicated King John of England ;” “1288, Nicholas IV., endeavoured to stir up the princes of Christendom to a new crusade, but without success ;” “1294, Boniface VIII., proclaimed that God had set him over kings and kingdoms, imprisoned his predecessor, and laid France and Denmark under interdict ;” “1303, Benedict XI., a pious and liberal pontiff, poisoned by some ambitious cardinals a short time after his election ;” “1378, Urban VI., so severe and cruel that the cardinals chose Robert of Geneva, under the name of Clement VII., which led to great violence ;” “1409, Alexander V., died supposed by poison ;” “1492, Alexander VI., the infamous Roderic Borgia, poisoned at a feast by drinking of a bowl he had prepared for another ;” “1513, Leo X. (John de Medici), this pope’s grant of indulgences for crime led to the reformation.” A few additional illustrations of the workings of Romanism in

the seat of its authority ensue. "1305, Clement V., Bertrand the Goth, removed the papal seat from Rome to Avignon;" and yet papal authorities declare that St. Peter has always occupied his chair in the eternal city! To such an audacity of lying does Romanism proceed! "1406, Gregory XII., elected during the schism in the East; Benedict XIII. being the other pope; both popes were deposed. John XXIII., elected during the great schism, deposed." More is at hand, if these quotations do not suffice to establish the unity and the universality of the see of Rome! We trouble the reader with only another extract:—"Paul IV., John Peter Caraffa. When Queen Elizabeth sent him an ambassador to announce her accession, he haughtily answered that to the holy see, and not to her, belonged the throne, to which she had no right as being a bastard." The foul word has never been revoked. The claim to the crown of England remains in perpetuity. Here is Rome's view of the nature of Queen Victoria's descent, and the validity of her power. Doubtless she smiles at the impotent insolence. Not the less does the answer of John Peter Caraffa illustrate the spirit of the papacy.

However, let the reader study these lineaments of the papacy, and say whether he sees in them the tracings of the hand of God, or the workings of the spirit of Belial.

We have passed in review the four marks chosen and displayed by the advocates of the Confessional as the proofs of the one true church, and as the proofs that that one true church is the Church of Rome. The investigation has shown the utter futility of the pretension. Rome is not one, is not holy, is not Catholic. Finally, Rome is not apostolic, either not absolutely, or not in the sense in

which the claim is made. Unity, holiness, catholicity and apostolicity are found together in no body of Christians, nor, consequently, in the Christian church, considered as a whole. Nor can they ever be found on earth, until the ideal presented in the New Testament is become real. Found combined in no separate form of Christianity, they could not be found combined in Rome, because Rome makes visibility a character of the Church of Christ. To a visible church, these four attributes can never belong until Christians become Christians indeed, possessing the spirit and living the life of Christ. Meanwhile the one true church, the only true church is the invisible church, the community who, whether in this outer or in that inner world, united in affection, purpose, and operation with their Divine Head, are consequently members one of another, as well as sons of God and heirs together with Christ.

Here is the place for Milton's fable of

The Head and the Wen.

“Upon a time the body summoned all the members to meet in the guild-hall for the common good. The Head, by right, takes the first seat, and next to it a large and monstrous Wen, little less than the Head itself, growing to it by a narrower excrescency. The members, amazed, began to ask one another what he was who took place near their chief—none could resolve. Whereat the Wen, though unwieldy, with much ado gets up and bespeaks the assembly to this purpose: That as in place he was second to the Head, so by due of merit; that he was to it an ornament, and strength, and of special near relation; and that if the Head should fail none was fitter than himself to step into his place;—therefore he thought it for the honour of the

body that such dignities and rich endowments should be decreed to him as did adorn and set out the noblest members. To this was answered that it should be consulted. Then was a wise and learned philosopher sent for, that knew all the charters, laws, and tenures of the body. On him it was imposed by all to examine and discuss the claim and petitions of rights put in by the Wen. He soon perceiving the matter and wondering at the boldness of such a swollen tumour, 'Wilt thou,' quoth he, 'that art but a bottle of vicious and hardened excrements, contend with the lawful and freeborn members, whose certain number is set by ancient and unrepealable statute? Head thou art none, though thou receive this huge substance from it. What office bearest thou? What good canst thou show by thee done to the commonwealth?' The Wen, not easily dashed, replies that his office was his glory; for as oft as the soul would retire out of the Head, from the over-steaming vapours of the lower parts, to divine contemplation, with him he found the purest and quietest retreat, as being most remote from toil and disturbance. 'Lourdain!' quoth the philosopher, 'thy folly is as great as thy filth; know that all the faculties of the soul are confined of old to their several vessels, from which they cannot part without dissolution of the whole body; and that thou containest no good thing, but a heap of hard and loathsome uncleanness, and art to the Head a foul disfigurement and burden—as when I have cut thee off and opened thee—as by the help of these implements I will do—all now shall see.' "

SECTION III.

THE CONFESSIONAL—ITS APPEAL TO THE SCRIPTURE.

What immediately precedes has shown the utter worthlessness of the claims of Rome. So far as argument is concerned, not one word more need be said. But Rome tries to impose on the world by an appeal to scripture. To that appeal then let us turn. As a preliminary, it must be distinctly said, that the appeal thus put in by Rome she has by no means justified. The appeal is by Rome to Rome. Rome recognises in scripture no independent authority, and, in consequence, does not possess in scripture an independent authority to which to appeal. The claimant rests his claim on himself. Such a claim is logically void.

That the appeal made by Rome to scripture is the appeal of Rome to Rome, is manifest from the facts—first, that Rome decides what is scripture; and—second, that Rome decides what scripture means. The orthodox papal doctrine finds utterance in the following statements:—

“The canon of sacred books put forth by the Council of Trent has a solid foundation in the primitive church, and is to be retained entire. The sacred scriptures, even in those things which pertain to faith and morals, are not so clear as not to need an interpreter. It is the office of the church alone to give the dogmatic interpretation of the sacred scriptures.”*

Clearly then the church determines the evidence on which her authority rests. Let us explain the position by

* Perrone, vol. ii. p. 1081.

a supposed case. A claims a property. Being required to state the grounds of his claim, he produces certain parchments from his strong box. The genuineness of the parchments is questioned. A replies that he vouches for their genuineness. Receiving for answer that he himself is on his trial, he takes refuge in what he calls Tradition. Interrogated as to the reliableness of tradition, which he declares to be anterior to his parchments, he offers his own word. But that word cannot, he is told, be admitted in evidence, since it is the very thing that has to be proved. Thus non-plussed, he tries to throw dust in the eyes of the jury by calling forth from the slumbers of ages fathers, schoolmen, and councils. "Then," he exclaims, with marked satisfaction, "these are my vouchers." But these vouchers, on enquiry, prove to be only the church itself and tradition—itsself under another form. However, they are allowed to come into court, and are subjected to examination. The result is the ascertainment that they are a confused and heterogeneous heap of metaphysical opinions, childish credulities, absurd superstitions, and historical discrepancies, with here and there a grain of gold and some grains of silver. The examiners declare that if Rome is what they are Rome is of all things that ever were upon earth the most diverse. Unable to gain advantage from these varieties and contradictions, Rome asks the court to condescend, at least, to cast its eye on the contexts of its parchments, for one look will give entire satisfaction. "Point," says the judge, "to the part or parts on which chiefly you rely." "They are here." "But these words do not establish your claim, for they do not mean what you impute to them." "O I am the sole judge of their meaning," exclaims Rome. "Then," rejoins the judge, with combined indignation and sarcasm,

“then why appeal to me? If you supersede the court the court can give no decision in your favour, and hardly would you wish to supersede the court were you conscious of having justice on your side. He that claims a property and makes himself judge and jury as well as claimant, has no claim of which he can satisfy his fellow men. You had better cut the matter short, and say you are right because you are right; or, if you prefer this way of stating your demonstration, say you are right because you cannot be wrong.”

These remarks would justify us in passing unnoticed the scriptural arguments adduced by Rome. Nevertheless, we shall give such consideration to the chief of them as the occasion allows, taking leave to enquire what is the true, what is the intrinsic, meaning of the words. The principal text adduced by Rome occurs in Matthew's gospel, XVI, 13-20, which, as necessary for its correct apprehension, I transcribe in full, putting by its side the parallel passages from the other gospels:—

<i>Matthew</i> , xvi, 13-20.	<i>Mark</i> viii, 27-33.	<i>Luke</i> ix, 18-22.	<i>John</i> vi, 66-69.
When Jesus came into the coasts of Cæsarea Philippi; he asked his disciples, saying,—Whom do men say that I the son of man am? And they said unto him; some say that thou art John the Baptist; some Elias; & others, Jeremias or one of the prophets. He saith unto	And Jesus went out and his disciples unto the towns of Cæsarea Philippi; and by the way he asked his disciples, saying unto them, Whom do men say that I am? And they answered John the Baptist; but some say Elias; and others, one of the prophets.	And it came to pass as he was praying alone, his disciples were with him, and he asked them, saying, Whom say the people that I am? They answering, said, John the Baptist; but some say Elias; and others say that one of the old prophets is risen again. He said unto them,	From that time many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him. Then said Jesus unto the twelve, Will ye also go away? Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe and are sure that thou

them, But whom say ye that I am?

16. And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

17. *And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou Simon Bar-jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.*

18. *And I say unto thee That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*

19. *And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.*

20. Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ.

And he saith, Whom say ye that I am? And Peter answereth and saith unto him, Thou art the Christ. And he charged them that they should tell no man of him. And he began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders and of the chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again. And he spake that saying openly. And Peter took him and began to rebuke him; but when he had turned about and looked on his disciples, he rebuked Peter, saying, Get thee behind me Satan, for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men.

But whom say ye that I am? Peter answering, said, The Christ of God, and he straightly charged them and commanded them to tell no man that thing; saying, the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be slain, and be raised the third day.— Compare John I, 19-42.

art that Christ, the Son of the living God.

On this last text Rome builds her sovereignty and infallibility. I transcribe her own statements.

“ Christ conferred on Peter the primacy of honour and jurisdiction over the church universal, the head of which he accordingly constituted the apostle. Peter received the primacy of jurisdiction immediately from Christ, and not from the church. The primacy bestowed by Christ on Peter was after Peter’s death to endure in the church for ever. Peter went to Rome, instituted the bishopric of that city, and governed it until he died. The Roman pontiffs, his successors in the bishopric of Rome, obtained the primacy by divine right, and not by human appointment, whether ecclesiastical or civil. The authority of the primacy, which the Roman pontiffs possess by divine right, is the episcopal authority which extends over all believers in Christ, bishops included.”*

Such is the doctrine ; of its nature and tendency we shall say nothing here, for the appeal now made is to scripture ; except that the edifice, as being large in magnitude, and threatening in aspect, ought to rest on solid foundation. Is such the character of the actual foundations ? A survey of the statement of Rome’s doctrine just given discloses two important facts :—1st, that the power claimed is not bestowed on any one in express terms ; and 2nd, that the power claimed depends on the right explanation of a passage of scripture. I proceed to show that these averments are correct.

1. The power claimed is not bestowed on any one in express terms. The power claimed is Rome’s supremacy, and, in that supremacy, her right to sway the spiritual, which necessarily includes the temporal, sceptre of the

* Perrone, ii, 885.

world. This is the power claimed. Where is the express bestowal of this power? If there is such a bestowal let the words be adduced. Certainly no such bestowal appears in the words under consideration. Whatever interpretation may be put on those words, no one of them expressly bestows the power claimed. Let the fact be carefully noted. The scripture does not say that Pius IX is the spiritual autocrat of the whole world; nor does it say that Peter was the spiritual autocrat of the whole world. Consequently, the scripture does not pronounce Peter or the pope God's viceregent on earth. The claimed supremacy then rests not on a clear, distinct and express scriptural declaration. If so, the scriptural ground of the claim can be nothing better than unclear, indistinct, and inexpress. Therefore, the ground is unclear, indistinct, and inexpress. The value of such a basis is very small. A basis so small is totally insufficient to sustain the Cyclopean masses heaped thereon by sacerdotal imaginations.

2. If direct evidence is lacking the indirect evidence may, nevertheless, be considerable. The indirect evidence can be only constructive evidence, and constructive evidence pre-supposes the validity of the constructing mind. Now, this evidence is submitted to minds in general in the design of bringing them over to Romanism. The ability and the right of those minds to interpret scripture, and generally to judge in scriptural and religious matters, are thus conceded. Such a right cannot co-exist with spiritual despotism, such as that claimed by Rome. The appeal to scripture made by Rome is thus suicidal. Rome sunders her own bonds in the very act of attempting to justify them. However, the argument is indirect and constructive;—in other words, the proof depends on the interpreta-

tion put upon a passage of scripture. Rome cannot here allege her right to determine what the true sense is, because that right is the very point at issue. She has consented to appear before a tribunal, and by its decision she must stand or fall. If then we ask what is the right construction of the passage, we receive diverse replies. The Catholic gives one meaning, the Protestant another. It would be easy to fill several pages with interpretations of various import. Here, however, it suffices to draw attention to the fact that two views of the passage have been taken. If so, the meaning is ambiguous;—consequently, on a passage of doubtful import does Rome's supremacy depend. Rome's infallibility depends on a scripture of doubtful import! The utmost then that can be said in favour of Rome is, that she may be God's vicegerent on earth. But what may be may not be; it is, therefore, equally true, that Rome may not be God's vicegerent on earth. The words are figurative. By a metaphor Simon is represented as a rock, and by a *paranomasia*, or play on words, that rock is made the basis of the spiritual edifice, the church. Three figures in this one sentence! Then comes another figure in "the gates of hell," that is, the power of Satan. A fifth figure follows in "the keys of the kingdom of heaven." This fifth is followed by a sixth figure. Now, each of these six figures must be understood, and their general import as a whole must be understood, ere an interpretation can with safety declare the meaning of the passage. And the understanding of every part, and of all, must be so clear and so certain as not to admit of gainsaying, ere there can be any approach to certainty in the meaning assigned. Under these circumstances there is little hope of one sole inter-

pretation being assigned to the words. And even had all Christian theologians agreed in one sole interpretation, the conclusion could have no higher certainty than the highest attainable by the human mind, which being fallible is insufficient to guarantee infallibility.

If we view the scripture as a whole, and apart from the 17th, 18th, and 19th verses, its import is, however, sufficiently manifest. Our Lord, in a marked manner, draws forth from his disciples (probably "the twelve") an emphatic avowal of his Messiahship. Having done so, he, knowing their hearts, and knowing consequently how Judaic their conception of the Messiah still was, proceeds to intimate the necessity of its correction, by distinctly declaring that he was about to enter into sufferings that would terminate in his death and lead to his resurrection. The idea of suffering thus presented as awaiting him, the Messiah, being repugnant to their apprehensions, occasioned surprise and called forth remonstrance. Peter, taking up the word, rebuked Jesus. Jesus on his part, throwing a look of wonder and grief over the circle, rebuked Peter, and went so far as to employ the words "Get thee behind me, Satan, for thou savourest not the things of God but the things of men." Finding, however, that the views of even his chosen companions were thus narrow and earthly, he judged them unfit, as yet, to teach others, and so forbade them to speak on the subject to any one. The view now set forth is that which is presented by Mark and Luke. Matthew's narrative presents the same view when restored to what may have been its original state, by the omission of the excepted verses. The view presented by the fourth gospel omits the rebuke administered and the rebuke received by Peter, while its

tone rises into that higher region of spirituality which is the characteristic distinction of that composition, as appears in the words ascribed to Peter,—“To whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life.”

I have said that Matthew's narrative, verses 17—19 excepted, accords with the narratives of Mark and Luke.—This requires some qualification; for Matthew says nothing of the reciprocal rebuking. Otherwise the remark is just. And it deserves attention that Matthew's narrative ends by reporting, “Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ.” This charge comes in naturally enough at the end of the 16th verse, but seems unintelligible if the 17th, 18th, and 19th verses are retained. The reason of the prohibition was, as has been intimated, the very imperfect and carnal view of the Messiah entertained by the disciples. That view, however, is, in Matthew's account, replaced by one which receives the Saviour's highest sanction, being so exact and so complete as to be the foundation of the church. Why, then, should it be withheld? Yet Jesus forbids its utterance, when to all appearance no reason exists for its concealment. The difficulty, however, occasioned by the 17th, 18th, and 19th verses vanishes when they are removed. And thus there arises a presumption that they did not form a part of the original gospel. This presumption is strengthened by the fact that their erasure puts Matthew and Mark into substantial agreement, while their retention occasions a divergence between them which is of the most serious description. Matthew makes Peter's confession the foundation of the church; Mark makes Peter Satan; in Matthew, Jesus approves what Peter says, in the most emphatic terms; in Mark, Jesus rebukes Peter; in Matthew, Peter

simply acknowledges Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God ; in Mark, Peter, after declaring to Jesus, Thou art the Christ, rebukes him whom he had thus confessed. In Matthew, Jesus declares (18th verse) that Peter, raised above the influences of flesh and blood, had received from the Infinite Fountain of light a revelation of his Messiahship ; in Mark, Jesus, after testing Peter's condition, by foretelling his own humiliation, declares that the disciple regarded the things not of God, but of man. These surely are contrarieties—great and painful. To us their removal seems incompatible with the retention of verses 17, 18, and 19 in Matthew's account ; obliterate those verses and the contrarieties exist no longer.

Two different views are here presented of Peter's state of mind. Of these, one describes him as inspired of God, and so instructed of the spiritual nature of the Messiahship of Jesus ; the other, as influenced by Satan, and so breathing a low carnal spirit. The two cannot co-exist. A preference must be given. To which ? The conduct of Peter in the hall of judgment answers the question. Before the resurrection of Jesus Peter's mind was dark as to the true character of the Messiah. Till then he was little more than a Jew, who had found and owned the national ideal in Jesus of Nazareth. The day of Pentecost alone completed his conversion to Jesus, as the Christ, the Son of the living God, and so made him truly a Christian.

Here, then, is an additional ground of suspicion against the passage. And in the light now gathered from Peter's well-known disgraceful denial of Jesus in his hour of darkness and peril, we seem justified in declaring that if Peter did at the time make the avowal ascribed to him in the 16th

verse, the avowal could not have been so understood by Jesus, as that he should declare it or its utterer the foundation of his church. The avowal was nothing better than a Judaical confession of Jesus—one that was compatible with savouring the things of men rather than those of God, and compatible also with its speaker being rebuked and characterised as Satan.

The suspected passage, however, contains, it is affirmed, the devolution on Peter of the headship of the church. A dignity so distinguished must have been highly valued by Peter. Yet no mention is made thereof in Mark's Gospel, though Mark is declared by the most ancient authorities to have written under Peter's direction. Strange, nay unaccountable, is the omission, if the narrative in Matthew had fact for its foundation.

Passing from these suspicious circumstances, and assuming that the passage is genuine Scripture, we ask what meaning the gift of "the keys of the kingdom" conveys, when regarded in a scriptural light? This can be ascertained only by the study of Scripture. If, now, the reader advert to the passage (Matt. xvi. 18) and to a correspondent passage (Matt. xviii. 18—20), he will find that the gift was, if made at all, made neither to the Christian church in general, nor to Christian ministers, nor to Peter only, nor to the popes, but to the apostles without limitation.—To the apostles, then, the gift belonged. Bestowed on the apostles, with the lives of the apostles the gift came to an end. It is nothing better than an assumption which makes the gift co-extensive with the duration of the church. The gift involved a certain power, and the nature of that power limits its possession and exercise to the apostolic age.—What is that power? No one is at liberty to seek an an-

swer in his own conjectures, nor in the systems of man-made divinity. Scripture is the sole expositor of scripture. Nor are we left without the needful aid. In Isaiah, xxii, 15, 20, seq., occurs a passage which supplies that aid: "And it shall come to pass in that day that I will call my servant Eliakim, the son of Hilkiab, and I will clothe him with thy robe and strengthen him with thy girdle, and I will commit thy government into his hand; and he shall be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the house of Judah; *and the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; and he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open.*" The person here addressed is "this treasurer (chamberlain or steward), Shebna, which is over the house," the palace ("the house of David"), of Hezekiah. (2 Kings, xviii, 37.) Shebna was superseded by Eliakim. Eliakim's office is described as consisting in opening and shutting; and the symbol of that office is a key, an appropriate symbol, as keys are employed to shut and open storehouses, &c., whenever stewards draw forth the good things they dispense. This symbol was common to the Egyptians, Hebrews, and Greeks.* The key, then, as the token of office, described Eliakim as God's steward. Consequently the gift of the keys made the apostles stewards of the house of God. As such Paul describes himself and Sosthenes, his "brother," in these words; "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries (once hidden truths) of God; moreover, it is required in stewards that a man be found faithful (1 Cor. iv. 1, 2). The authority of the keys is then ministerial, and it involves that particular

* Consult the article *Key*, in "The People's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. II, p. 151.

kind of ministry which is designated by the title steward. Accordingly the same apostle styles a bishop "the steward of God" (Tit. i. 7). This is a light in which Jesus himself speaks of the apostles (Luke xii. 37 and 39), specially describing them as "servants," in the Greek *slaves*. (Comp. Luke xvi. 8.) The passages referred to show what functions the office involved. They are administrative functions—the due supervision of the household—that is, the exercise of all that the domestic economy required; in other words, the supply of the daily wants, and the direction of the daily acts, of the "fellow servants" of the establishment. Such an office, when applied to the spiritual kingdom of the Messiah, denotes the administration of the spiritual manna which the Great Householder has provided, and of which he made the apostles stewards. Instruction is then the essential function of the office. The keys symbolise the "feast of fat things" prepared of God for those who are willing to accept his invitation to the marriage supper. (Matt. xxii; Rev. xix, 7.) Those keys are placed in the hands of Peter and the other apostles. With those keys they are to loose and to bind, in such a way as to minister the bread which came down from heaven to be the life of the world. Whatever pertains to that ministry pertains to them. That ministry is in its nature spiritual.—Spiritual in consequence is their office; spiritual in the order and after the manner of the spiritualities of the public life of Christ. Co-ordinate and co-extensive with those ministrations, the apostolic ministry extends not beyond their field. Moreover, it is a ministry subordinate to the ministry of Christ. As such it possesses no independent power. Its authority is derivative. As derivative it has not the prerogative of transmission. The devolution of

their power belongs not to servants, but to their masters, from whom they themselves received their functions. Only by the express command of their masters can servants hand over their office and authority to other servants. But the apostles received no such command. Consequently "the apostolic succession" was first a fiction, and then a usurpation.

Another line of remark will combine to show how vain is Rome's endeavour to plant here an impregnable citadel. The power of the keys is delegated authority. Every delegated authority partakes of the mind and spirit of the sovereign by whom it is delegated. In his mind and spirit, then, the authority finds both its character and its measures. In consequence the mind of Christ declares the meaning of the passage. For the right interpretation of the passage we must study the mind of Christ. The aims of that mind as well as its measures were purely spiritual. Both its aims and measures were no less gentle than spiritual. The whole of Christ's public ministry was an act of persuasion. But every act of persuasion recognises a common nature as between the speaker and those who are spoken to. It recognises also on the part of the latter a judgment capable of determining justly, a will free to choose, and so a right to form a decision. The authority here delegated must in consequence be an authority similar to that which Jesus exercised; and the authority which Jesus exercised was the authority of the intelligence which he received from God, wherewith to appeal to the same intelligence which God, their Father, breathed into the minds of men. The authority, then, was the authority to teach and preach God's everlasting truth, with a view to its prevalence and dominion in **h**umankind. Such authority

is divine, equally in its origin and its effects. Such authority comprehends all that divine truth needs in order to secure its acceptance and promote its efficacy. Now truth instructs; besides instructing it reproves; besides reproving it condemns; having condemned, it punishes; equally does truth acquit, heal, foster, redeem, or, to speak more exactly, the Spirit of God working through its instruments, that is, through Christ and Christian teachers, employs such spiritual tillage in individual souls as may aid them to bring forth abundantly the fruits of righteousness. God's dealings with man in the gospel, as in Providence, are disciplinary, and as such they educate, train, and form the life so that it may assume the Father's image, as shown in his own Son. The authority, then, of the minister of Christ, feeding and guiding the flock of the Great Shepherd, is the authority, not of man-made law, nor of the carnal weapons of the sword, the prison, the stake, but of divine truth—its divinity, its majesty, its loveliness, its congeniality with the better parts of man's nature, its consequent acceptableness to the better parts of man's nature; and the rich and ever-growing rewards it bestows on everyone by whom it is received, loved and cherished. The authority thus explained is the authority which repeatedly appears in the New Testament as that which was bestowed by Christ on his apostles, and as that which was virtually exercised by them in establishing his kingdom on earth. The same authority is in substance possessed by every Christian, and every Christian possesses that authority in the degree in which he possesses the spirit of Christ. Specially is that authority possessed by all who so possess the mind of Christ as to be worthy to be his ministers, that is, channels for the conveyance of the Spirit of God, as manifested by

Christ, to their fellow men. The authority is not outward, but, like its source, inward. Being inward, it consists not in sacerdotal unction, but in the baptism of the Holy Spirit. It stands not in the rights and functions of an order, but in the life and power of the hidden man of the heart. In a word, it is God's Spirit formed in the soul of his human child.

This, we say, is the consecration of the Christian minister—be he an apostle, a prophet, an evangelist, an elder, or a deacon. Consequently this is the power which Peter received from Christ. Other power than this can no man receive, if only because this is the power which Christ received from God; and if other power than this is that which Rome has thought to obtrude upon or deduce from the New testament, her attempt is no less nugatory than un-Christian. Rome's pretensions, then, are to be judged by the general spirit of the New Testament, which is an embodiment of the spirit of Christ, which is the Spirit of God. The statement finds support and exemplification in the words and deeds of men of God in every age of the church, especially in the description given by Paul of the functions of the Divine Spirit, as manifested in the holy men of old, who were led by the Spirit of God (Rom. viii. 14—Gal. v. 18); who, as Peter himself declares (2 Pet. i. 21), “spoke as moved by the Holy Ghost;” and who, under the impulses of that Spirit, gave birth to that Scripture, which is profitable for doctrine (instruction), for reproof, for correction, for training-up in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works (2 Tim. iii. 14 seq.). Not greatly dissimilar to the corruption presented by the metaphor of the keys, is that which Jesus puts forward under the figure of a good

householder, who, holding the keys of his establishment, locks and unlocks his cupboards, and brings forth out of his treasury things new and old (Matt. xiii. 52). Such, says the Great Teacher, "is every scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven." Such, then, must the pope be, if he, possessing the keys of that kingdom, is a scribe truly and fitly instructed unto his sacred functions. Whether or not he is a scribe or teacher so instructed may be learnt, if we compare the general tenor of his administration with that of Christ's householder, as described in another part of the same chapter (24—30), who, when his servants wished to pluck the tares out of the wheat as they grew together, said, "Nay, lest, while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them; let both grow together until the harvest, and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather up together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them, but gather the wheat into my barn."

The true nature of the power intended in our passage has now been ascertained. Not content with a power which puts her priests on a level with all true ministers of Christ, Rome claims a power equally special, arbitrary, and miraculous. The reasons assigned are, 1st, that Peter is the rock on which the church is built; 2nd, that to Peter the power was communicated; and 3rd, that from Peter the power was transmitted, in direct succession down to Pio Nono. I proceed to consider these allegations in the order in which they are here placed.

1st. The power was bestowed on Peter, because Peter is the rock on which the church is built. Referring to remarks bearing on the point already advanced, I ask attention to what ensues. The substance of the matter is involved

in the question did Jesus, in speaking of the rock, intend Peter as a person or Peter as a symbol? Peter as a person he could not mean, literally because a person properly taken cannot be the foundation of an edifice of any kind. The name Peter, then, must be understood figuratively. The actual figure lies in the root-meaning of the name, in which there is an allusion to a rock or stone. What is that rock? Is it Peter himself or Peter's confession of Jesus as the Christ? Peter himself, as we have seen, it cannot be, consequently it is Peter's confession. Through Peter *a rock*, allusion is made to *the rock* on which the church is founded, namely, the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth. The *petra* (rock) involved in *Petros* is *Peter's* avowal "Thou art the Christ." This interpretation, thus educed from the words themselves, is the interpretation suggested and required by the tenor of the whole passage. The question on which all turns is "Who or what am I?" Peter answers "The Christ." "Yes," rejoins Jesus, "I am the Christ, and this truth you have received from the Father of lights; the truth like your name, Peter, is a rock; it is the rock on which I will build my church. Nevertheless, the exact and full meaning of the truth is not perceived even by you, nor is the time yet come for its open publication, therefore I bid you not to proclaim it." In order to prepare the minds of his heralds for fitly announcing the truth, Jesus explains to them his coming sufferings and death, and so suggests the thought that it was in a spiritual sense he was the Messiah. The interpretation thus suggested by the context is required by it as the condition of its intelligibility and consistency. Without it the passage is not intelligible, for this is the thought that runs through the whole. Without it the passage is not consistent, for

beginning and ending with the official character of Jesus, it is consistent only so far as the Messiahship of Jesus is left undisturbed by any other subject. But the personal position of Peter is another subject, and, as another subject, interferes with the one subject, which is Jesus in his divinely appointed relationship to man. Eliminate that second and foreign subject and the passage is consistent; equally plain and simple is it as well as consistent. It will not, however, be denied that Peter knew what was the real foundation of the church. Not long after the incident took place Peter raises his voice in the public places of Jerusalem to begin the new spiritual temple. Does he represent himself as the foundation? Of himself he says not a word. Jesus is his theme; and Jesus in what light? As the Messiah. These words contain the substance of his preaching—"Let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ." (Acts II, 36.)

2nd. It is also alleged that it was to Peter the power was communicated. The allegation means that it was communicated to Peter exclusively. For a moment let the allegation be granted; it follows that, with Peter's death the commission came to an end. "But through Peter the commission was transmitted to others." Then it was not given to Peter alone, but to Peter and his successors. Is it this which is declared in the text? "His successors" is put in to meet the necessities of the case, by the papal advocates themselves. But is it on Peter that the authority is bestowed? It is on Peter, as one of the apostles, and it is on the apostles, as comprising Peter. In an emphatic manner Jesus addresses himself to the twelve, saying (in the Greek,)

“But you, who say ye that I am?” and after Peter’s confession, Jesus again, speaking to the twelve, “charged *his disciples* that *they* should tell no man that he was the Christ.” Peter here, as in other places, merely appears as the spokesman of the apostolic band. That it is not to Peter, exclusive of the eleven, but to the twelve, inclusive of Peter, that the gift must be referred, is put beyond a question by Matthew XVIII, 18, where “the disciples” (1) in general are spoken to in the same terms—“Whatsoever *ye* shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever *ye* shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” Equally comprehensive in its application is another passage, which Romanists are apt to cite in favour of papal claims, viz., John XX, 19, 23, where we read, “Whosoever sins *ye* (the disciples) remit they are remitted.”

The third allegation is, that through Peter the power was given to the popes. The allegation is utterly devoid of scriptural authority. Jesus makes no declaration to that effect. The disciples alone are spoken to and spoken of in the text. Had Jesus intended that the authority should have been transmitted through Peter to a particular class or order of men, he would, it is presumable, have employed the appropriate words.

On one occasion, after his resurrection, Jesus appeared to “the disciples” and said, “Peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me so send I you; and when he had said this he breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive the Holy Spirit; whose soever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain they are retained.” (John XX, 19—23.) The disciples present were ten, for Judas was dead and Thomas absent. To these ten the Holy Spirit was communicated, and therewith the

power to remit and retain sins. Here, then, there is not the shadow of a reason for asserting any speciality on behalf of Peter. But if Peter received no special authority on the occasion, no special authority could he transmit. The Roman priest, in consequence, possesses no advantage or pre-eminence. On the contrary, as the gift of the Spirit precedes the commission, so the commission is conditioned by the possession of the Spirit. But the gift of the Spirit here mentioned, which began with the ministry of Jesus and was completed on the day of Pentecost, was a gift which, resulting under divine Providence from the special influences, exerted of God through Christ on the eye-witnesses and companions of Christ, was altogether a special gift, and bestowed for a special end, namely, the proclamation and establishment of the Gospel in the world. Conferred under these special circumstances, and for this special end, the gift is in its nature, restricted to those on whom it was bestowed. This view is confirmed by the emphatic manner in which Jesus parallels the mission of the apostles with his own, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you," that is, "You are to continue and complete the divine work which the Father entrusted to my hands;" namely, the full development of my religion and its definitive establishment in the world. The same idea comes out of the fact that Jesus, in commissioning his apostles, omits to include in his instructions any power, authorising them to transfer their apostolic gifts to either a number or a line of successors. Such a transference is too important a matter to have been overlooked on the part of the Saviour; it is equally too important to be assumed on the part of ministers of his church. Indeed, the cause of the papacy is weakest at the very point where it should be strongest. The power

of transference on the side of the apostles, and the right of reception on the side of the bishops of Rome, are the hinges on which the papacy rests. Yet these points are in air—unsustained by any scripture and unguaranteed by any valid tradition. Attempts have been made to reason them into existence, but the attempts are too futile to deserve serious refutation, especially as no process of reason can support that infallibility which is built on the supposed transference; for infallibility, as an attribute of a man, is contradicted by reason as well as set at nought by experience. It is no answer to say, that in the absence of this transference the church would be left without guidance; for the scripture has been deposited in its bosom by the hands of Divine Providence, and an all-sufficient interpreter of the scripture in the perpetual presence in the hearts of believers, of the spirit of Jesus, which is the spirit of God. This spirit is the enlightening, directing and comforting power which was to hold the place and perform the functions of the earthly Christ in the Christian community. This, the sole scriptural vicar, or *locum-tenens*, of the earthly Christ, was promised and given to all the apostles, without exception and equally without distinction, to remain with them until the end of the apostolic age*; and through their ministry (John xvii, 20, 21) and the general influence of the Gospel, involving the presence and co-operation of the Father and the Son, was to remain a permanent bequest to the church, conditioned on each disciple's own loving faithfulness, and productive not of uniformity of opinion, but unity of spirit in faith, hope and love.†

* John xiv, 15 seq., 18, 26; xvi, 7 seq.; xx, 21—23; Matt. xxviii, 20; Acts ii, 14 seq.

† John xiv, 23; I. John ii, 24, 25; I. Cor. xiii, 6; Phil. ii, 12, 13.

Had Peter and the rest of the apostles received from Christ the power to forgive sins, and to open and close the gates of heaven, the exercise of that power on their part would have been prominent in the book of Acts and traceable in the epistles. It will not be said that the apostles were unfaithful to their commission. That commission they doubtless executed with exactitude and fulness. Where, then, is the passage which exhibits them, pronouncing the final and irrevocable doom, in the act of forgiving sins? It is a single matter of fact that they limited themselves to the preaching of the forgiveness of sins, as the gracious gift of God through Christ. Thus Peter himself interpreted his commission—"He (Jesus) commanded us to preach unto the people * * that through his name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins." (Acts ii, 43.) Thus, too, he executed his commission—"Him hath God raised up * * to give repentance unto Israel and forgiveness of sins." (Acts v, 31 comp. ii, 38; iii, 26.) "Be it known unto you, men and brethren, that through this man (Jesus) is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins." (Acts xiii, 38.) That Paul entertained the same idea of the proper apostolic functions, and that he duly fulfilled them, are manifest from this classical passage:—"All things are of God who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the ministry of reconciliation; now then we are ambassadors for Christ as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." (II. Cor. 18—20.)

Indeed, the evangelist Luke shows, in a very distinct manner, that it was nothing else than the office of preaching forgiveness of sins that Jesus, when about to pass into the invisible world, devolved on his apostles:—"Jesus said unto them, 'Thus it is written and thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day; and *that repentance and remission of sins should be preached among all nations.*'" (Luke xxiv, 49, 47.) This preaching, the aim of which was to make disciples (Matt. xxviii, 19), had two sides, of which the one was an offer of pardon and life, the other an announcement of condemnation—"He that believes shall be saved, he that believes not shall be condemned." (Mark xvi, 66.) The former is the power to loose; the latter is the power to bind. Both, it will be seen, are declaratory. In both, the apostles announced God's intention, proclaimed God's act, and so performed the part of God's heralds or ambassadors.

And thus we are brought to the simple and the true meaning of the words: "Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained;" that is, "Your proclamations, as my heralds, whether for acquittal or for condemnation, shall hold good;" "those who, on their repentance, you declare pardoned are pardoned; those who, persisting in sin, you declare condemned are condemned." The reason is, that the heralds of a sovereign, in proclaiming his terms of acceptance, thereby proclaim the consequences which ensue in the instance of both those who welcome and those who refuse those terms. After the same manner, we say, "The law condemns the guilty," "the law acquits the innocent." The real origin of the phraseology, as well as its exposition, is found specially in language descriptive of

the divinely directed action of the Hebrew prophets, who are said to do that which they announce as done. Thus Isaiah is addressed of God in these words, "Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes" (vi, 10); that is, "Declare the heart of this people fat, declare their ears heavy, and declare their eyes shut." Of Jeremiah, too, Jehovah is described as saying, "See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build and to plant" (i, 10), the import of which is made clear by the foregoing verse (9), "Behold I have put my words in thy mouth;" that is, "I have made thee my mouthpiece to announce rescue to the obedient and ruin to the perverse." The great function which the apostles were to perform, in regard to sin and sinners, was to pray for their forgiveness. This is said on the authority of the example of two of them, Peter and John, who, having in view those who were aliens from God by wicked works, besought God to stretch forth His hand to heal "them of their sins" (Acts iv); a pertinent illustration of whose conduct is presented in King Hezekiah's prayer and its answer: "But Hezekiah prayed for him, saying, the good Lord pardon every one that prepareth his heart to seek God; and the Lord hearkened to Hezekiah and healed the people." (II. Chron. xxx, 18 seq.)

The statements which have been made and the explanations given are, it should be observed, not the product of our mind, nor the suggestions of our own creed. Such a method, however common, must be deprecated by every approvable expositor of scripture. By this blameworthy method theologians, both Protestant and Catholic, have fastened their personal and individual pre-conceptions on

scripture, and so given it the appearance of favouring views most diverse, to each and all of which it was in truth fundamentally adverse. Instead of following an example which has been, and ever must be, prolific not only of diversities of doctrine but injurious falsities, we have educed the meaning of the sacred writers from their own words, by studying the general import of each passage, and comparing passage with passage, under the light thrown on them, not by modern usages, but the idiom of the originals, and particularly the peculiar forms of utterance in vogue among the Hebrew people, whose genius and spirit prevail and appear in the New Testament almost as much as in the Old.

The final result is, that the apostles, no less than God's servants in general, appear to have been commissioned to announce God's providential dealings as manifested in and through Christ, involving retribution as well as recompense, the burden of which is expressed in this which may be pronounced their universal commission:—"Say ye to the righteous that it shall be well with them, for they shall eat the fruit of their doings;—woe unto the wicked, it shall be ill with them, for the reward of their hands shall be given them." (Isaiah III, 10-11.)

In substance this remains the preaching of every minister and every disciple of Christ until the end comes when God's will shall be done on earth as it is in heaven. The difference between the general ministry of righteousness and the ministry of the apostles lies not in the thought, purpose, or aim, nor in any supernatural power or executive authority, but in the possession of a greater or less measure of that spirit of God and Christ, which is the source of all true spiritual force and the condition of all

real spiritual influence. That spirit was given to the Christ without measure, was bestowed on the apostles in proportion to the faithful use they made of their singularly auspicious opportunities, and is still, and ever will be, communicated to disciples according to the use they make of the talents with which they are entrusted. (1st Cor., XII; Matthew XXV, 14 seq.)

One other passage adduced in their own behalf by Romanists may receive brief attention. I allude to James V, 16—"Confess your faults one to another and pray for one another that ye may be healed." On these words Rome builds her doctrine of auricular or sacramental confession.

Confession is by Catholic authorities defined as "A declaration which a sinner makes of his sins to a priest in order to receive absolution."* This is sacramental confession as distinguished from ordinary confession, which is defined as "the act by which one avows the truth respecting some fact." It is with sacramental confession that we have here to do. If we analyse the definition we shall find that

Sacramental Confession comprises—

1. A declaration of *sin*.
2. A declaration of sin *made to a priest*.
3. A declaration of sin *made in order to obtain absolution*.

I subjoin the words on which papists rely in several versions—

Auth. version....*Confess* your faults one to another.

Vulgate*Confess* your sins mutually.

Rheims*Confess* your sins one to another.

* Encyclopédie Theologique, par Migne, p. 766.

Wielif { *Knowleche* (acknowledge) ye to eche other
your synnes.

Luther.....Let one *acknowledge* his sins to the other.

Tyndale*Knowledge* your fautes one to another.

Cranmer*Knowledge* your fautes one to another.

Geneva*Knowledge* your fautes one to another.

It is thus seen that the translations range themselves into two classes,—one giving *Confess*, the other *Knowledge*, that is, *acknowledge*, as the rendering of the original Greek verb, *exomologeomai*. Of these two renderings the former, *Confess*, is of Romanist origin; the latter, *acknowledge*, of Protestant origin. The source of “Confess” is the Romanist Latin translation of the scripture; the source of “*acknowledge*” is Wielif. Now, *Confess* and *Confession* have acquired a religious import, and, with Catholics at least, denote “the sacrament of confession,” while *acknowledge* retains a secular meaning. There is nothing in either word, considered etymologically, to restrain it to a theological or a secular signification. To confess (made up of *eum*, *with*, and *fari*, *to speak*) denotes agreement with another in speech, as when I confess to you that I have done you a wrong. To acknowledge is to say I know or to own what you assert, *e. g.*, that I have done you a wrong. Similar in import is the Greek term which is made up of elements denoting that in word or utterance I agree with you, that is in the charge you bring against me. Before I make use of the facts thus acquired I beg the reader to observe that any advantage which may accrue from the terms *Confess* and *Confession* are derived from the Romanist rendering of the Greek. Here then, Rome fabricates her own weapons. Making her proof herself she gains a victory unlawfully, and must not expect the domi-

nion she establishes to endure. From the statements now made it appears, however, there is nothing in the words themselves to require the admission of a theological, a religious, still less a sacramental meaning. All the conditions are satisfied when we say that confession or acknowledgment is the admission of a wrong *by one person to another*. Even this statement exceeds what may be termed the necessary meaning of the Greek word. That word does not of itself involve the idea of wrong-doing. Strictly taken, it signifies the avowal of concurrence, it may be the concurrence of thought, and so mean to consent to promise; or the concurrence of will and affection, and so mean to praise. In illustration I transcribe passages from the New Testament with the authorised translation:—

[Luke XXII, 6.

Auth. version...He (Judas) *promised* . . . to betray Jesus:

Tyndale..... He *consented*

Rheims He *promised*

Auth. version....Jesus said, I *thank* thee, O Father: Matthew
XI, 25.

TyndaleJesus said, I *praise* thee,

Rheims I *confess* to thee,

Vulgate I *confess* to thee,

Luther I *praise* thee.

These instances suffice to prove that the word does not of itself comprise the idea of sacramental confession. That the term in general denotes agreement or concurrence is clear from the use made of it by our Lord in the last cited passage, where it declares the oneness of the mind of Christ with the mind of God. Denoting generally agreement, the word may be applied to denote the agreement of an accused person with his accuser. This import, however,

comes not so much from the verb itself as from accessories. Thus, when the term sin is explicitly or implicitly added to it, the verb denotes the acknowledgment or confession of sin. So it is used in the New Testament twice :

Auth. version... .. were baptised, *confessing* their sins :

Matthew III, 6.

Wiclif werun waischen *knowlechen* her synnes.

Auth. version... Every tongue shall *confess* ("give an account")
to God : Romans XIV, 11.

Auth. Wiclif... Eche tunge schal *knowleche* to God.

The verb is also used to denote a religious acknowledgment or avowal, as of God, or Christ, or the Christian religion : Rom. XV, 9 ; Philip. II, 11 ; Rev. III, 5.

Thus instructed as to the scriptural usages in regard to the verb, we will take up in succession the three elements comprehended in sacramental confession, and enquire whether they are contained in the text.

1. Sacramental Confession is a declaration of sin. Sin is a wilful transgression of God's law—(Rom. II, 23 ; IV, 15.) Does, then, the alleged proof-passage of necessity involve the idea of sin ?—not necessarily. The noun *parap-toma*, considered in its etymological meaning, signifies a *falling against* (comp. "*fall*" in Rom. XI, 11), and so a stumbling, a mishap, a falling-out, or collision. Accordingly, it may refer to the misunderstandings of private and social life ; and, hence, offences occasioned by one person or member of a family to another. The idea of sin does not lie in the essence of the word. All the word denotes is comprised in *offence*. Accordingly, the authorised version, following Tyndale, renders the noun here and in Gal. VI, 1 by *fault*. That the word may be applied to mistakes or misdeeds, considered as between man and man, is obvious

from its use in Matt. VI, 14—"If ye forgive men *their trespasses*." Indeed the context makes it plain that James did not in the passage refer to sin strictly so called, for he speaks of sin in the verse immediately preceding, employing another word, the appropriate word. I copy the whole : "If any sick among you let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord ; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick and the Lord shall raise him up ; and if he have committed sins (*amartias*) they shall be forgiven him. Confess (acknowledge) your faults (*paraptomata*) one to another, and pray for one another, that ye may be healed." Now why use a different word unless to denote a different idea? Sin then is not meant, but faults or offences. Accordingly, while James speaks of sins as forgiven, he speaks of offences as being *healed*, clearly indicating that healing of mind which ensues when brethren own their faults, and so make reparation to those whom they have wounded or offended. The word "heal," showing what metaphor was in the mind of the writer, may be considered as the key to the meaning of the passage. It was wounded feelings that were in question rather than breaches of the law of God. The distinction, however, which James makes between sins as forgiven and offences as healed the Vulgate and its Rheims translator conceal, perverting the sense with the rendering "saved"—"and pray for one another that you may be saved." The facts now elicited and adduced combine to justify the assertion that the apostle in the text had no reference to sins properly so called. The noun then does not denote sins. We have before seen that the verb does not involve the act of confessing sin. Hence we conclude that the sacred writer had

not in his mind, when he wrote the passage, any idea of sin or confessing sin. We are, in consequence, authorised to deny that the first element of sacramental confession is found in the text. James, when he said "Confess your faults," did not mean "Confess your sins," still less, "Confess your sins sacramentally." It has been suggested that James refers to the falls or failures which were occasioned by weakness in the hour of the fiery trial of persecution. Such stumblings, though lamentable, may not have partaken of the character of sin. Pitiable rather than blameworthy, the infirmities were to be healed by brotherly sympathy and generous support. The writer's eye, however, appears directed into the church rather than into the world.

2. The remainder of our task is very easy. Sacramental Confession is a declaration of sin *made to a priest*. The second element of sacramental confession lies in the words "made to a priest." The second element is not in the text. The second element is excluded by the text, for the text expressly defines to whom the acknowledgment is to be made, namely, "one to another." It is, moreover, excluded by the previous verse, where, in the case of sin, "the elders" are to be called for; but no such requirement is made in the text, the reason being that these offences were not sins but offences or misunderstandings, which could be healed or accommodated without the specific assistance of the elders of the church. In other words, it was a secular more than a religious business. The words "one to another" clearly denote the members of the church in general, as appears by the use of the term "brethren" (19). The whole passage indeed points to the mutual helpfulness of the disciples in general, and

suggests a picture broadly and strongly contrasting with the state of utter dependence on themselves in which the Romish priests hold their adherents. The members were to "confess one to another;" no distinction is made;—"each to each" seems to have been the principle; that is, each to each so far as the members had ought the one against the other. The phrase either includes the presbyters or excludes them. If it includes the presbyters it condemns Rome, for its priests confess only to priests. If it excludes the presbyters it condemns Rome, for their priests, as such, have neither part nor lot in the matter.

3. The third element of sacramental confession involves an end, and that end is "in order to obtain absolution." No such end is expressed or understood in the text. The sole end found there, and that as the result rather of prayer than confession, is "that ye may be healed."

Our final remark is conclusive. We have hitherto confined ourselves to the alleged text and its immediate connexion. Here, however, as everywhere, the general tenor should be ascertained and borne in mind; for in all cases the true meaning arises out of the general tenor of a passage. The earlier part of the Epistle makes it clear that the writer had in view persons who, from their diversities of social position, were partial, envious and disagreeing, and that to an extent most lamentable. Hence James declares "in many things we all offend, if any man offend not in word the same is a perfect man, and able also to bridle the whole body" (iii, 2). These offences arose from regarding the persons of men (ii, 4), from there being "many masters" (iii, 1) "speaking evil one of another" (iv, 2). Accordingly, only a few verses anterior to the text the apostle says "*Grudge* (grumble) not one against

another, brethren, lest ye be consumed ; behold the Judge standeth before the door" (v, 9). How natural the sequence contained in the text "Acknowledge your faults one to another, and pray one for another that ye may be healed."

I conclude this critical survey of one of Rome's strongholds, by citing words used by Paul, which supply both comment and illustration on the passage :—

"Brethren if a man be overtaken in a fault ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself lest thou also be tempted ; bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ." (Gal. vi, 1, 2.)

"But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another." (Gal. v, 15.)

"We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves ; let every one of us please his neighbour for his good to edification : for even Christ pleased not himself." (Rom. xv, 1—3.)

Scarcely possible is it for two things, bearing on the same subject, to differ more widely than the confession enjoined by James and the confession enforced by Rome. The former is a simple acknowledgment of faults, the latter is a sacramental confession of sins ; the former is common to all the members of the church indiscriminately, the latter is limited to the penitent and the priest ; the former is made without concealment, in the open abode or before the full assembly, the latter is made within the Confessional, to a secret ear and under a pledge of secrecy ; the former is sorrow seeking brotherly reconciliation, the latter is contrition seeking sacerdotal absolution ; the former leads the soul upward to God, the latter detains the soul on earth with man ; the former includes supplication

with as well as for each other, the latter makes the priest the sole effectual agent and the exclusive channel; the former brings down into a home or a church the healing spirit of divine and fraternal love, the latter ensures absolution and shortens the woes of purgatory—that is, when the appointed fee has been paid and the imposed satisfactions performed.

CHAPTER IV.

MEANS AND INSTRUMENTS.

SECTION I.—THE CONFESSIONAL—ITS DOCTRINE RESPECTING HERESY.

Were the Confessional a notion or a speculation cut off and sundered from actual life, or were it an active reality, working at a distance from our own shores, its nature and influence might be a curious subject of investigation for the scholar or the antiquary, but would possess no very considerable claims on the attention of practical and busy England. In reality, however, the Confessional affects not only Catholics but Protestants; for it teaches the former in what light they should regard the latter. The social ethics of the Confessional determine the sentiments and, in a measure, the conduct held by its disciples towards those who are beyond their pale. But social life is full of reciprocities. My feelings toward you determine your feelings toward me. Your treatment of myself is repaid by me in kind. Hence kindness begets kindness. Equally does harshness engender harshness; and if intolerance is

not returned, it fails not to occasion suspicion, distrust and fear. And so it comes to pass that Rome's illiberality makes the interchange of friendship with her adherents difficult, if not impossible, no less on their own part than on the part of Protestants, and, in place of mutual good will, places mutual alienation and possibly aversion.

We state these facts without wishing to justify them ; and we state these facts because we think it desirable that Protestants should be exactly aware in what light they are regarded by Rome and its adherents. The mutual toleration which for the most part Protestants cultivate and exercise one toward another, the less informed among them, and especially those with whom it is a religious duty to think no evil of a neighbour, naturally expect from persons who, though Catholics, are yet Christians. They, perhaps, go so far as to think that, as love calls forth love, so liberality on their own part will, at least in time, produce liberality on the part of Romanists. Accordingly, they show liberality—they show it, but they meet with no return. "Give and take" is no Romish maxim. It is all take and no give. It is your duty to yield ; it is the duty of the priest to require. He is the master ; you are the servant : nay worse, you are a disobedient and refractory servant, liable to diverse punishments, and if you persist in your contumacy you will be condemned to everlasting woe.

If this representation is correct, Romanism is wholly and incurably unsocial ; Romanism and Protestantism cannot live in peace together ; intermarriage among them can issue in nothing but disunion, and the disunion may end in enmity and disaster. Nearly as difficult is it for the two to co-exist comfortably on the same soil and as members of the same civil society. In truth Romanism, when side by

side with Protestantism, is intolerantly aggressive. If weak, its intolerance is concealed or veiled. If strong, its intolerance is open, bold and vigorous. If mighty, its aggressions aim at exclusive dominion. Not a country in Europe is there, in the present day, where the two are found together, but these statements are exemplified and verified incessantly.

Nor can it be otherwise. Romanism means intolerance. This position finds its justification, as it has its origin, in Rome's doctrine respecting heresy and heretics. With Rome heresy is not a mistake, nor an error, nor a falsity, but a crime—a crime of the will, and, as a crime of the will, so punishable. And heretics are simply criminals—criminals who, though out of the church of Rome, perhaps driven from its bosom, are nevertheless amenable to its tribunals and exposed to its penalties. With these doctrines all that Rome needs is power, to make her punish the writer and the reader of these lines, for their heretical pravity, in any and every way likely to subdue our obstinacy and take from our example its baneful tendencies.

Made aware of these facts by our studies in Catholic authorities, we think it our duty here also to show Romanism in its true features. And first, we translate from Scavini (II., 443) the following :—

“ Infidelity is the lack of faith. Heresy is a species of infidelity. Heresy arises when faith, being received, is rejected. Heresy passes into apostacy if it is totally rejected.

“ Heresy, from a Greek word signifying choice, is an obstinate error contrary to some dogma of the faith in him who has accepted the faith. Hence four things go to constitute heresy : 1, on the part of the intellect, an erroneous

judgment contrary to the faith, or directly opposed to some revealed truth, and sufficiently set before a person as such ; this is material heresy ; 2, on the part of the will, obstinacy ; which is formal heresy ; 3, on the part of the subject there is required an open profession of Christianity, or faith in Christ by baptism. Besides material and formal heresy is, 4, either latent or manifest ; latent, when known to no one, or but a few ; manifest, when known to many. Heresy is a very grievous sin, since it deprives a man of justification from the very foundation, and contemns God's authority. If we are asked whether one who doubts as to the faith is a heretic, we reply : He who doubts positively is, beyond question, a heretic, as is expressly stated in the canonical law. One who doubts in the faith is a heretic ; for he, in his own mind, chooses a judgment contrary to the faith, and is truly obstinate, whence he incurs the appointed penalties. If a person so suspends his judgment as practically to judge that the considerations opposed to the faith make the Catholic truth uncertain, he is equally a heretic for the same reason. Since heresy is a merely ecclesiastical crime, there can be no legitimate judge in that crime except the church ; 1, the supreme pontiff for all the world, and the holy congregation of cardinal inquisitors general appointed for the purpose ; 2, each bishop in his own diocese, on whom lies the duty of keeping his flock from poisoned pastures is devolved ; 3, when the diocese is vacant, the capitular vicar, as the bishop's *locum tenens*. Every person, whatever his rank or dignity, if he knows any one to be a heretic, is bound to denounce him to the bishop or inquisitor, under pain of excommunication ; from which penalty any confessor may absolve the guilty after they have made the denunciation. The denunciation must

be made within thirty days, and even if the heresy cannot be proved, or if it is ascertained in confidence, *or under an oath not to make it known* ; for the preservation of confidence is a private good, but the denunciation of heresy is a public good ; because heresy is a pestilence which makes its secret way like a cancer, and ever tends to spiritual injury at large ; and an oath is not binding against good morals. The duty is urgent, even if the heretic is amended, both because he has probably corrupted others by his heresy, and because a person may feign himself to be amended in order to escape punishment. The duty is urgent also when a heretic has been denounced by others, because out of the mouths of several witnesses the judge becomes more certain of the crime and the culprit is more easily convicted. This duty is urgent, finally, when any one is only suspected of heresy, or is a disciple, an entertainer or a supporter of heretics. Those who are to be considered as suspected of heresy are : 1, confessors who entice to libidinous acts or break the seal of secrecy ; 2, priests who contract marriage ; 3, persons convicted of polygamy ; 4, secular priests who celebrate mass or hear confessions ; 5, superstitious persons ; 6, blasphemers ; 7, those who speak against the denunciation of heretics, unless it is done through friendship ; also those who neglect to denounce heretics, if it is their duty to do so ; 8, moreover such as despise the power, rites, laws and commands of the church ; 9, who deride and calumniate the sacraments and their utility, prayers, indulgences and suffrages (transferred acts of merit) for the dead ; 10, who utter blasphemies against God, against the blessed Virgin, against the saints ; 11, who allure others to base and disgraceful deeds, or say that impurity is either a light evil or no evil at all ; 12, who

neglect to learn the rudiments of faith and morals, although of adult age, and live a dissolute life, so as to appear to have altogether lost the faith both internally and externally. Some exceptions may be made if we speak generally, e.g. no one is bound to denounce himself, nor are blood relations held obliged to denounce each other; "if we speak generally," we say, for if the question respects dogmatising heretics, or averting a public evil, then all are required to denounce heretics, because heresy is a pest so noxious as to be cured not without extreme difficulty, when once it has struck its roots into society.

"As to the intercourse of Catholics with heretics three things are to be observed. In regard to the heretics, who in civil matters are tolerated by the church:—1. Catholics in having intercourse with them must take special care, lest they hence suffer spiritual detriment; 2nd, and Catholic laics must enter into no disputation with them on matters of faith; 3rd, Catholic authorities are not to permit heretics to be present at the sacrifice of the Mass and other sacred services, except preaching and catechising. In respect of Italians:—1st, no Italian shall, on any pretext, dwell in places inhabited by heretics, or in regions where there is not some church with a Catholic priest who has the right to celebrate publicly our religious observances; 2nd, no Italian shall enter into matrimony with an heretical woman; 3rd, nor be present at the interment of heretics, nor be sponsor for their children, nor allow heretics to be sponsors for their children, unless they are baptised by a catholic priest; 4th, no Italian shall employ an heretical physician if he can have the services of a catholic one; 5th, when Italians are about to take up their abode in countries where heretics are tolerated, they shall

acquaint their priest with the fact, that they may receive suitable admonition. Hence it is manifest that catholic parents who, preferring some temporal gain, send their children into heretical regions, commit a grave sin—1st, against charity; 2nd, against piety; 3rd, against the faith. Communion in religious matters, of catholics with heretics, is forbidden altogether. Catholic laymen incur excommunication if they dispute in private with heretics touching matters of faith; nor are priests so to dispute, except in specified cases. Both laics and clerges are inhibited to hold public disputations touching matters of faith, without the express permission of the pope.”

Our next quotation exhibits heretics as out of the church and in the church—both relations being punitive:—

“It is easy to show that those who are heretics by their own act belong in no way to the church. Sectarists and schismatics are as so many branches cut out of that great tree which Christ planted that it might grow to the end of the world; they are as rivulets separated from their fountain, members sundered from the body. As rebels against the determinations of the church, the church has condemned and severed them from its unity. It is objected, that if heretics and schismatics are not in the church, the church can exercise no jurisdiction over them. True, if under no title, they belong not to the church. But heretics and schismatics are subjects of the church by reason of baptism, and since the impression made by the sacrament is permanent and indelible, the church as long as they live, has over them, in their character of rebellious and refractory persons, a permanent and inalienable right, and that much more than a prince has over subjects who have thrown off their allegiance. Yet, you say, the church

by its own act sometimes rejects and expels heretics from its body. It rejects and expels heretics in order to punish and correct them, and to keep its children free from the peril of contagion; but by no means does it abdicate the right which it possesses over them.”*

The same high authority teaches that persistence in heresy incurs eternal ruin. (Perrone i, 255.)

“There can be no salvation for such as depart this life being culpably in heresy, schism, or unbelief. Not only are they guilty of the greatest crime who hold the truth of God in unrighteousness, and who make a gain of the damnation of souls, but all those who do not employ all diligence in the search of truth and return to the bosom of the church. Heretics do not build on the foundation of Christ, but destroy and subvert it, ‘whom God will destroy’ as the apostle adds. The crime of heresy does not consist precisely in mere aberration of mind or in ignorance, but in obstinacy of will, which opposes itself to the mastership of the church, whence it appears that a person prefers his own private judgment to a legitimate authority instituted by Christ, and this includes rebellion, and is of its sort *the worst of all crimes*. Heretics, then, are punished for their obstinate resistance to the doctrine of the church, and for voluntary rebellion. It would be inhuman and cruel to allow a man guilty of a deadly sin, as are heretics, to remain exposed to damnation. Let them repent and return whence they have departed; but if they will not, and therefore perish eternally, let them impute the blame to themselves. But if any one according to his will, innovate in matters of faith, it would be all over with the faith itself and with the unity founded by Christ.”

* Perrone I, 223.

An eloquent remonstrance against the maxim of Rome, "out of the church no salvation," came from the pen of J. J. Rousseau. "God forbid," says he, in his famous *Emile*, "that I should ever preach to men the cruel dogma of intolerance! If there were on earth a religion, beyond whose pale there was nothing but eternal punishment, and if in any part of the earth a single mortal were not struck with its evidence, the God of that religion would be the most unjust and the most cruel of tyrants." "You announce to me," so he makes his barbarian speak, "a God who was born and died two thousand years ago at the extremity of the world, in I know not what small town; and you tell me all who do not believe in that mystery will be damned. You are come, you say, to teach me this; but why did you not come to teach it to my father; or, why damn that good old man for never having known anything about it? Ought he to be eternally punished for your neglect? he who was so beneficent, and who sought only the truth?"

Intolerance and Romanism are, however, one. Intolerance lies at the centre of Romanism. The fact is known and admitted by its honest advocates. Witness the following words from the pen of a learned and eloquent lay apologist of Rome:—

"We justify the principle of "out of the church no salvation" by an appeal to common sense, which expresses itself in the following dilemma: Either there is a religion or there is not. If there is no religion, all is said; to debate the question of its intolerance is idle, for that would be to discuss the mode of the existence of that which does not exist. If there is a religion, it is absurd to reproach it with the dogma of exclusive salvation, because this religion

being in its essence the way of salvation, you deny its existence, though that existence you pre-suppose, when you wish for salvation out of its bosom."* (Vol. iii, 288.)

According to this doctrine intolerance is involved in the very idea of religion. The subject seems to stand in the author's mind in this shape: Religion is the way, that is, the only way to God. Are you in that way?—then you are saved. Are you not in that way?—then you are damned. Consequently religion is of necessity intolerant. Truth cannot tolerate error. Oneness excludes multiplicity. Admit that there is but one religion, that is, one way of salvation, and you have admitted the duty of intolerance. But this is the doctrine of Rome. Virtue can not tolerate vice. Then truth can not tolerate falsehood. And the sole means by which you can liberalise Rome is by teaching her, either that there may be more than one way to God, or that *her* way is not *the* way.

Mons. Nicholas is consistent. Hence he contends that the author of religious intolerance is Jesus Christ. "The pretension of the church in this matter is the pretension even of Jesus Christ. When he said 'I am the way, the truth and the life; no one cometh to the Father but by me,' he founded the spiritual intolerance of truth before God." He adds, "The pious and profound author of the 'Imitation of Christ,' commenting on these last words of the Saviour, adds, 'Without the way you cannot walk, without the truth you cannot know, without the life you cannot live.'"—(iii, 289.) It is then manifest that Rome can no more cease to be intolerant than light can cease to shine or water cease to flow.

* "Etudes Philosophiques sur le Christiaisme," par A. Nicholas, 1852.

If an ecclesiastical decision is desirable it is here—in the words of the great jesuit doctor, Perrone, (i, 265):—

“ Religious toleration is impious and absurd. Toleration is of two kinds, political or civil, and theological or religious ; of which the first may be called extrinsic, the second intrinsic. Political toleration is the liberty or power which the prince or state gives to citizens of professing that religion which each may prefer ; religious toleration is the express or tacit profession of the truth of all religions and all sects, by which you hold that all religions and all sects are equally true and good, and, in consequence, equally salutary to man. According to this principle no religion and no sect can accuse and reject another as false. Thence arises indifferentism, as it is called, toward all religions as possibly being true, good, divine ; so that it is the same whether you follow the one or the other. Here we do not speak of political toleration, for there are conjunctions in which it is not only proper but necessary. That *religious toleration is impious and absurd* we prove—1st, from the consideration that thereby revelation becomes plainly useless ; 2nd, and on such an hypothesis there would be two or more truths mutually contradicting each other ; 3rd, God would then equally patronise truth and error, and equally love and save those who obeyed him, and those who voluntarily and culpably resisted him, and rejected truths set forth by him to be believed ; whence it follows that God is indifferent to truth, falsity, virtue, and vice, obedience and rebellion ; but what is this unless to destroy the very idea of God, and to introduce the God of Epicurus ? 4th, If you speak specially of the diverse sects of Christians, Christ, according to this doctrine, would be the author and revealer of all the con-

trary opinions that are found in the almost numberless sects that are separated from the church and divided amongst themselves ; whence it may be inferred that universal religious toleration would bring destruction to all religions which, while supposing them to be equally true, declares them, by the very act, to be equally false, or at least doubtful ; whence, in the second place, it may be inferred that toleration can be defended only by those who have no religion or faith, that is, by Atheists, Deists, Protestants, who, since with them everything is uncertain, seek by this persuasion a certain peace of conscience which they would not otherwise obtain ; and indeed this toleration began to be proclaimed by protestants after Rationalism, or the new Philosophy, had grown up among them, which took out of their hands all revealed religion. A third inference is, that the peace which the indifferentists or tolerationists pursue is not true quiet of mind, but languor and stupor, hardly, or not even hardly, unlike death itself : for they are pleased with darkness rather than light, or, at least, death and destruction do not displease them ; they are pleased with the tranquility of death and the sepulchre. And this disease of mind and heart is the severer and the more incurable the more it is neglected and unknown ; for what can you do with a man who refuses to be healed, who denies that he is sick, who, when on the point of death, considers himself well and only not just immortal ? His wound is incurable. A fourth inference : This is the principal cause why all, whether deists or sectaries, are so averse to the unanimous voice of catholics, namely, that there is no salvation out of the catholic church. Wherefore, we must raise our voice like a trumpet ; for this voice, while it disturbs and keeps anxious, though contrary to their will,

those who are in error, may, perhaps, prove a salutary remedy to them. It certainly is very much to be lamented that some recent writers, under the pretext of a false piety, or led by vain hope, scarcely venture to maintain openly this dogma of our faith, and that, too, in those countries in which the evil has chiefly grown and needs an effectual cure; nay, they so strive to weaken it, that it loses all its force; moreover, by this miserable way of acting, while Protestants receive no good from the qualifications, the truth is betrayed, and vacillating Catholics are led into the danger of extreme ruin. The plea that the public peace demands that each should be permitted the religion of the land is *good only when that religion is the true religion but bad otherwise, for never ought men to assent to a lie, nor have princes any right to allow a false religion, since they specially are bound to embrace the true religion.* You object that if a person does not follow the religion of his country, he cannot obey its laws. I answer, *the laws which favour any but the true religion are essentially null, for they oppose God.* Then only are we bound to obey man when he requires things not contrary to God, for we must obey God rather than men when they enjoin things contrary to God. There is either no religion or the catholic religion is the only religion; no middle point exists. Those who culpably die in heresy, schism, or unbelief, cannot be saved. Out of the catholic church salvation is impossible."

It would be easy to add statements to the same effect from other distinguished sources.

M. Gosselin, confessor at the Seminary of Saint Sulpice, in Paris, declared* in 1855—"In the principles of antiquity,

* Gosselin; *Pouvoir du Pape au Moyen Age*; 2nd Ed. 1845. Introduction p. 71. See the account of Père la Chaise hereafter.

recognised also by the most celebrated modern publicists, the moderate use of temporal pains and penalties against heretics and the other crimes of impiety, is equally important for the good of religion and the repose of society. It is true that in this matter, as in every other, the application of the principle often presents great difficulties, but the difficulty of applying a principle, otherwise well established, cannot obscure its truth."

That this is a just statement appears equally from the principles and the practice of popery. The pope, as the vicar of Christ and the visible head of the church, possesses, and, so far as he can, exercises, dominion over men's souls. But he that has dominion over men's souls has dominion over men; for the inner shapes and determines the outer, nor is the outer more than the expression and the image of the inner. Hence the papal authority comprehends the body as well as the mind; and hence, too, the civil power, no less than the ecclesiastical, is amenable to the tribunal of the Roman see, nor can it pretend to any higher than a dependent and responsible authority. But every constituted power must be furnished with motives, and those motives must cover the whole ground of its power. Consequently the motives employed by Rome comprehend the body as well as the soul, and sway the arm of the magistrate no less than the voice of the bishop. In other terms, the sword, equally with the crosier, is in the hands of the pope. This is a matter of right. This ensues from the conception of his office and functions. The assertion of this right in all its plenitude is a question of practical policy and ecclesiastical statesmanship, to be determined with due regard to opportunity. The right itself, however, is inherent in the papal theory, and has ever been put

forward and realised in fact so far as a consciousness of its prerogatives could command success. .

This is the view taken of papal rights by papists themselves. The theory remains unchanged, and has, from time to time, been in various degrees embodied in law and custom, and so formed the living germ of social as well as religious life.

The general doctrine here laid down is openly and fully set forth in works written on the subject by Catholic writers, for the instruction and exhortation of members of their own communion, and appears in modified forms only in writings intended for unfriendly eyes, and for propagandist purposes. It is, accordingly, distinctly stated that the pope, as pope, has jurisdiction over things external to the mind as well as internal; over princes as well as bishops; over secular courts as well as ecclesiastical courts; and this power is supreme and alone; the civil power is not co-ordinate but subordinate. I transcribe a few statements which the author of the manual, whose title stands in the margin, sustains by citations from the authorities universally admitted in his communion. "The pope possesses supreme power in the church. The power extends by discipline to external things, and not merely to faith and morals. The church has a true power to command and compel by punishments. Persons whom the church has censured it has the right to hand over to the secular arm. It is a part of the duty of the pope to convene, transfer, preside over and dissolve councils. The authority of the pope is superior to that of a general council. The pope can dispense with the laws of the church universal. It does not belong to the secular power to rule the church, to abrogate ecclesiastical laws, to dispose of the property of

the church ; and apart from the jurisdiction of the state, the ecclesiastical power makes its own laws, holds councils, inflicts penal compulsions." To cite the terminating words employed of his own authority by pope Nicholas I, in a letter which he addressed to the Emperor Michael (A.D. 865): "The first seat (or higher tribunal) shall not be judged by any one ; neither by Augustus ; neither by the whole body of the clergy ; neither by the people shall the judge be judged."*

Gregory XVI, in his encyclical letter published in 1832, calls the liberty of conscience "an absurdity, a delirium," and the liberty of the press "most foul and never-to-be-enough execrated and detested." In 1804, one of the principal grounds given by the pope in refusing to crown the first Napoleon, was that the oath of consecration mentioned "liberty of worship." In 1832, the famous Cardinal Pacea, the pope's prime minister, wrote: "If in certain circumstances prudence compels us to tolerate them, that is, the liberty of worship and the liberty of the press, as one tolerates a less evil to avoid a greater, such doctrines cannot ever be presented by a Catholic as a good, or as a desirable thing." These facts, taken together, set before us the Romanist doctrine of tolerance and intolerance. It may be summed up in these few words—"Intolerance where we can, tolerance where we must." So is it with their advocacy of the one or the other. Intolerance is avowed where Rome is in the ascendant. Tolerance is preached and demanded where Rome is in the shade. The two, however, are means to the same end, namely, sole and supreme dominion.

The view taken by Rome of heresy is made manifest by

* *Enchiridion Symbolorum et Definitionum.*

what she at this moment requires of every bishop in the ceremony of his consecration. Among other questions, the bishop elect is asked, "Dost thou curse also every heresy raising itself against this holy Catholic church?" Answer: "I do curse it." This averment is ratified by the oath of consecration. Having sworn "to defend against every one the Roman papacy and the royalties of St. Peter, and to observe, and cause to be observed by others, the rules of the sacred fathers, the apostolic (papal) decrees, ordinances or disposals, reservations, provisions, and commands," he adds, "*heretics, schismatics, and rebels against our Lord or his successors I will to the utmost of my power persecute and assail.*"* Thus every Catholic bishop is a sworn enemy to heretics, that is, to every disciple of Christ throughout the world, not being a Romanist. All such persons he has anathematised and sworn to persecute. Not to create ill blood, but simply as cautionary, we wish the Protestant reader to note this unsocial, not to say inhuman, fact. The fact comes to this:—Whenever you cast your eyes on a Romish bishop you are justified in saying to yourself "there is a person who, because I am not of his religion, has pronounced me accursed, consigned me to hell, and would, had he the power, exclude me from intercourse with my kind, nay, put me in prison, and torture or burn my body." The extent of application involved in the averment and the oath is known only to those who know that all Protestant princes, as well as their subjects, lie at this moment under the interdict and anathema of the papacy. Most of my readers are aware that England, while she has a representative at every court in the civilized world, has no repre-

* Pontificalia Romana, de Consecratione Episcopum. Mechliniæ; 1855, vol. i, p. 84, seq.

sentative at the court of Rome. The reason is, that England lies under the ban of the pope. Every papal bishop, we have just said, swears to defend the regal and other prerogatives of his lord and master. Among these is supremacy over all lands and all thrones, Catholic as well as Protestant. In the exercise of that prerogative the see of Rome has pronounced the deposition of the Protestant sovereigns of England, and only wants and waits for the power to give effect to its decree. In that act every Romish bishop in Queen Victoria's dominions is a willing, nay, a sworn, participator. In the Bull *Unam Sanctam Ecclesiam*, issued by Boniface VIII, November 18th, 1312, "that pontiff reciting the doctrines and pretensions of his predecessors, declares that the only true church is one body having one head, and not two (emperor and pope), like a monster. This head is Christ and his vicar Peter and Peter's successor. Two swords there are indeed, one in the hand of the priest, the other in the hand of the king. The latter is, however, to be employed under the guidance of the priest. The temporal sword must be subject to the spiritual, and the temporal authority to the spiritual authority. The spiritual power appoints the temporal, and directs it when it tends to go wrong. Finally we say, declare, and determine, that whoever will be saved must, of necessity, believe that every human creature must be subject to the Roman high priest." Proceeding on these measureless prerogatives, Rome anathematised and deposed the princes who took part with Luther. When Henry VIII declared himself the head of the Church of England, Paul III summoned him to appear before his ecclesiastical bar in Rome. The king disobeyed; thereupon the pope hurled his ban at the monarch, pronounced his

throne forfeited, declared him, his children, his adherents, without rights and without honour, and bestowed his crown on the king of Scotland. No sooner had Elizabeth succeeded to her catholic sister, Mary, than Pius V put her (1570), as a protestant, under his anathema, absolved her subjects from their oath of allegiance, and declared that, as a heretic, she had lost all right to rule over orthodox catholics; and, in consequence, that her subjects were not to obey her, but to treat her as a pagan. More dangerous for the heretical queen was it that Pope Sixtus V, in the year 1588, at the time when Philip was preparing the Armada to conquer England, issued the ban anew in a special bull, declaring Elizabeth deposed, commanding every body to desert her, and offering her dominions to the king of Spain. The pontiff, in his hatred of misbelievers, gave a million of *scudi* toward the cost of the war, and put on board a general vicar of the Inquisition, with above 100 monks and jesuits. We hope they did not go to the bottom of the ocean, but we are very glad that they did not land in England. The Armada failed and perished, but the Romanists, especially in Ireland, were made rebellious. The sore then caused has been kept open ever since. O'Connell lent his aid, and Pius IX continued the irritation by having masses said in his own chapel on behalf of the demagogue.

A summary of all the papal pretensions to absolute dominion over church and state, whether protestant or catholic, is contained in the infamous bull, called from the first words—*In coena Domini*, or “the Maunday Thursday Bull.” As early as the fourteenth century the popes celebrated Maunday Thursday by the public recital of a bull, in which they pronounced a curse on all who did not ac-

knowledge the alleged rights of the papal see. In process of time this bull was enlarged and extended. It was re-issued by Pius V, who commanded it to be publicly read on Maunday Thursday in all churches throughout the world. It was again renewed in 1627 by Urban VIII. Here the student* may read the final settlement of the papal constitution relative to heretics. The pope "in the name of God, and by the authority of the apostles Peter and Paul, as well as his own authority, puts under his ban and curse "all Hussites, Wiclifites, Lutherans, Zwinglians, Calvinists, Huguenots, Baptists, and every other heretic," anathematizes all who believe in them, receive, and protect them, read, possess, print, publish, or defend, their heretical books, as well as all schismatics who withdraw from communion with Rome. With a similar curse he denounces all universities, colleges, cathedrals, which appeal from a papal decision to a general council, or advise such an appeal. "In the same way we ban and damn all princes who impose new taxes or increase old ones in their territories, except in such cases as have been granted to them of right or permission by the apostolic see." Further all they are cursed "who shall hinder the transmission of food or necessities to the papal court; who lay hands on cardinals, legates, and other prelates; who appeal to temporal tribunals on account of any papal command; who compel priests to appear before temporal tribunals, pass laws against the liberty of the church, obstruct bishops in the administration of justice, divert the revenues of the apostolic see, impose taxes on the clergy without the pope's permission, even though they be emperors and kings; moreover, all magistrates and subalterns who interfere

* Bullarium Magnum Romanum, iv, 113 seq.

with the penal discipline of the clergy, and all who attack, disturb, or seize the inalienable prerogatives of the successor of St. Peter." In order to give greater effect to the penalties threatened in this truly apostolic letter (how like it is to one of Paul's or John's !) it is declared that "no one but the pope, and he only on the approach of death, shall have power to absolve from the anathemas, and that all claims and rights obstructive of the execution of the bull are and remain null and void."

Not any of these claims have been withdrawn. Not one of these curses has been removed. Still does Rome employ her poisoned arrows as much and as effectually as she can. In 1791 Pius VI declared the oath then taken to the French Constitution inadmissable, and stript of his gown every priest who assumed the obligation. Pius VII indeed formed a Concordat (1801) with Napoleon, but in 1808, in his circular letter to catholic courts, he said it was "as false as calumnious that the concordat allowed toleration toward other forms of worship. The treaty contained not one word having reference to any worship, condemned and forbidden by the Roman church." When in the congress at Vienna certain church lands already secularised were acknowledged as such, and the Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed confessions were alike recognised, Cardinal Consalvi, Rome's representative, entered a solemn protest, declaring that the arrangements were not recognised by the papal court. Unhappily the statesmen then assembled satisfied themselves with silently disregarding the pretension. "The Holy Alliance" restored power to the papacy without taking guarantees against its abuse ; hence the troubles about mixed marriages in populations made up of catholics and protestants ; hence, too, the gradual encroachment of

the papacy on protestantism in Great Britain. The principles of Rome involve an internecine war against protestantism whether in church or in state. That war Rome never ceases to conduct with such efficiency as in every successive moment she is master of. That war is at this hour proceeding in England with increasing energy and effect.

The doctrine held by Rome regarding heresy and heretics is no mere theory. Fearfully and terribly consistent, she has allowed her essential intolerance to make her actively and constantly persecuting whenever and wherever she has had the requisite power. Among the punishments she inflicts is Excommunication. Excommunication is of three kinds—the lesser, the greater, the anathema. The lesser is incurred by mere companionship with an excommunicated person, whether in prayer, conversation, eating, or drinking;—the penalty is partial sunderance from the church. Among the words by which the bishop pronounces the greater excommunication are these: “By the authority of God Almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and of all the saints, I, in consequence of his contumacy, excommunicate A.B. by these writings, and denounce him as to be shunned until he shall have fulfilled what he is commanded, that his spirit may be saved in the day of judgment.”* The substance of the anathema runs as follows:—“Because A.B., under the impulse of the devil, has, through his apostacy, not feared to devastate the church of God, to plunder ecclesiastical property, and violently to oppress Christ’s poor ones; therefore we, fulfilling the Lord’s and the apostles’ precepts, and employing the sword of excom-

* Pontificale Romanum, iii, 117; Ordo Excommunicandi et Absolvendi.

munication, cut him off from the body of the church as a putrid and incurable member, lest the other members of the body be infected by so pestiferous a disease. Accordingly, since he has despised our admonitions and not confessed his crime, nor besought pardon, but, the devil hardening his heart, has persevered in his wickedness, we separate him and all his accomplices from the society of all Christians, and shut him out from the bounds of holy mother church in heaven and in earth, pronounce him excommunicated and anathematized, and consign him, damned with the devil and his angels, to eternal fire." If, however, the culprit repents he may possibly be received back into favour, provided he is prepared to submit to the required penalties and humiliations. In case of his being an apostate, schismatic, or heretic, those penalties and humiliations are specially severe. After, in addition to other modes of treatment, the accursed one has been exorcised, so as to be freed from the devil, he is asked "Do you renounce Satan and his angels?" "I renounce them." "Do you renounce every kind of heathenism, heretical wickedness, and Jewish superstition?" "I renounce them." "Do you wish to be and to live in the unity of the holy catholic faith?" "I do." Then the guilty man makes a solemn promise, saying, on his knees, (with other things) "I, A.B., having learnt in what a snare of schism I was held, have returned to the unity of the apostolic see, and promise to thee, bishop of so and so, and through thee to Saint Peter, prince of apostles, and to our most holy father in Christ, and to our lord the pope and to his successors, that I will never return to schism, and if I do, may I be found guilty of eternal punishment, as having incurred the sin of perjury, and have my portion in the future world

with the author of schism." A still more emphatic form, designed for a repentant heresiarch, prescribes the use of these (with other) words: "I publicly curse all heresy, especially that with which I have been disgraced. I agree with the holy Roman church, and with heart and voice promise to believe the apostolic see, and to hold that faith which she teaches; swearing the same by the holy *homousion*, that is, the trinity of the same substance, and by the holy gospels of Christ; and those persons who oppose that faith, with their doctrines and followers, I declare worthy of eternal damnation." A special and still more fearful curse is pronounced on such as induce a nun to break her vow. In other words, if a nun should change her mind and enter into wedlock, her husband would bring on himself the direst denunciations of the church by his practical heresy, though he might act as conscientiously as did Luther in marrying Catherine Bora. Thus runs the curse: "By the authority of Almighty God, &c., we (the bishop) under the pain of anathema, forbid all persons to lead these virgins away from their vow of chastity. If any dares to attempt this may he be cursed at home and abroad; may he be cursed in the city and in the field; may he be cursed when awake and when asleep; may he be cursed when eating and when drinking; may he be cursed when walking and when sitting. Cursed be his flesh and his bones; from the sole of his foot to the crown of his head may he have no soundness. May there come on him the curse which the Lord in the law pronounced by Moses on the sons of Belial. May his name be blotted out from the book of life. May he have his portion with Cain the fratricide, with Dathan and Abiram, with Ananias and Sapphira, with Simon Magus, with the traitor Judas, and with those who

say to God ‘Depart from us, we will have none of thy ways;’ let him perish in the day of judgment; let perpetual fire devour him with the devil and his angels, unless he repent and make restitution. So be it! so be it!”*

A combination of these severities is found in that cruel measure which the church calls her Interdict. The Interdict is directed by the popes against heretical or disobedient princes, kings, and commonwealths. Acting on the assumption that the pope as the sole (proper) bishop of Christendom has supreme jurisdiction over the whole, the court of Rome, when it judges necessary and prudent, excludes a kingdom or a province, from all the services of the church. In the unhappy land thus smitten with a curse, the churches are closed; no bell rings, no service is performed; no marriage is celebrated; children remain unbaptised; interment in consecrated ground is refused to the dead; and heaven is sealed against the penitent, the sick and the dying. Most fearful is such punishment to a people believing that the priest is the only way to God. And most efficacious as well as fearful was this combination of curses in what Romanists call “The Ages of Faith,” when Rome, by such means, was able to bring kings and emperors to its footstool. For instance, John, king of England, refused to acknowledge the pope’s nominee as archbishop of Canterbury. Accordingly, in 1209, Innocent III put that monarch under the ban of his Interdict, whereby, in three years, John was forced to yield, and to receive from the pope his kingdom as a fief of the apostolic see. Other instances abound. The terms employed for the frightful work may be learned from the curse pronounced by Pope Clement VI on Maunday Thursday, (*or the day of cursing*).

* Pontificalia Romana de Consecratione Virginum.

1346, against the excellent German emperor, Louis of Bavaria :—" Let him be infamous ; let him be powerless to perform any public office, to appoint any public officer, to bear witness, to receive an inheritance, to make a will. No one shall be obliged to render to him any account, but he shall be compelled to give account to others ; he shall have no appeal to the laws ; invalid shall be any judgment he may give ; no advocate shall lend him aid, no notary shall lay before him a document. All his goods are confiscated, and neither his children, nor his children's children, shall be appointed to any office in church or state. Every one is forbidden to speak to him (except for his conversion) and to have any communion with him ; and when he dies he shall not be buried with the rites of the church. All temporal princes are commanded to drive Louis out of all the countries subject to his jurisdiction. I invoke the divine power to bring the senselessness of the said Louis to shame, to overthrow him with the might of its prerogatives, and to cast him into the hands of his enemies and persecutors. May the blow which he does not know come upon him. Cursed be his in-coming, cursed his out-going. May God smite him with idiocy, blindness, and rage. May heaven hurl its lightnings at his head. May the wrath of Almighty God burn on him in this life and the life to come. May the world be in arms against him ; may the earth open and swallow him up alive. Let his name perish in his generation ; let the remembrance of him vanish from the earth. May all the elements be his foes. May his dwelling be waste ; may his sons be expelled from their abodes, and, before his eyes, may they fall into the hands of their deadly enemies."*

* Bretschneider's *Reformation der Kirche*, p. 29, seq.

Such is the awful and barbarous cursing and swearing by which he whose name denotes him as the father of the church, has striven to assert his despotic sway, and extinguish heresy and disobedience. Even here, however, the pope has not stopped. When he found that "the curse causeless" did not take effect (Prov. xxvi, 2) he appealed to the cruelties of torture and death. Resolved to stamp out everywhere the sparks of religious reform, which he called heresy, he set in activity the sanguinary process of the Inquisition. What Christian land felt not the terror of his displeasure? In Spain above 341,821 persons were condemned to the flames between the years 1481 and 1808. On many a page impartial history has written the papal deeds of violence in letters of blood. The facts are patent to all. Nor are the facts of questionable import. Rome indeed sometimes attempts to throw the blame on the civil power, but the civil power is but the instrument of the ecclesiastical. *Qui facit per alium facit per se*: "You do yourself what you do by your servant." The church that teaches persecution is answerable for the blood which persecution sheds. Besides, the direct action of the church is often tracible. If the magistrate bore the sword the hand that wielded it was the hand of the priest. What else does he do who impels me to deeds of blood? The guilt of wars of religion lies at the door of the church. Witness the decrees of the third Lateran General Council, held in 1179,—“As says the blessed Leo, although ecclesiastical discipline, satisfied with sacerdotal judgment, does not inflict sanguinary punishments, yet it is aided by the acts of catholic princes, that men may seek the remedy while under the fear of bodily penalties. On that account, since in Gascony, Albi, and the parts about Toulouse, as well as

other places, the damnable perversity of the heretics whom some call Cathairi, (Puritans) some Patarennes, some Publicans, others by other designations, has obtained prevalence to such an extent that now no longer, as the rest, they carry on their wickedness in secret, but publicly display their errors, and draw over the unwary to their views, we decree that they, and those who receive or defend them, are anathematised, and, under the pain of anathema, we forbid all and every to receive them into their homes, or allow them to be in their lands, or give them any succour, or have any dealings with them." Having commanded a sacred war against their foes, the council say, "We relieve from two years' penance every faithful Christian who shall take up arms against the heretics." The fourth Lateran Council (1215), having condemned the doctrine of the Albigenes and other heretics, commanded their goods to be confiscated, themselves to be driven from their lands, and forbid any one to protect them or give them hospitality. The crusade against the Albigenes carried the decrees of the council into effect.

The crime of persecution is not expiated even if you succeed in showing that protestants share your guilt. Some of the early Reformers, imbued with Romish intolerance, did contract the stain of bloodguiltiness. The unnatural sin its perpetrators must answer for at the bar of impartial justice. We pity but we cannot screen them even in word. But, unlike Romanism, Protestantism is persecuting only by accident. This appears if only from the large and liberal views of Christian liberty published at the beginning of the Reformation by eminent protestant leaders. Referring the curious to the work the title of which is given below,* for particulars no less interesting than full,

* *De Hæreticis an sint persequendi*, Basle, 1554.

we confine ourselves to a brief statement of the doctrine taught by Luther, translating his words literally: "The civil power has those laws to which the bodies and fortunes of men are subject; beyond these, it has no right, no power. God neither wishes nor can bear that the mind should be constrained by human laws, for He only has jurisdiction and empire over the mind. Therefore, when the secular magistrate attempts to impose a law on minds, he lays his hand on God's property, so as to pervert and destroy souls. This we will make clearer than the light, in order that our bishops and princes may understand how foolishly, not to say impiously, they act while they endeavour by their laws and edicts to compel men to believe in this way or in that. If any one should wish by his decrees and laws to drive persons to believe thus or thus according to his will, it is most certain that he is not supported by the word of God, and if he lacks the support of the word of God, he displeases rather than pleases God, who wishes our faith to be pure and sincere, founded solely on his word. The soul is exempt from human power and the secular magistrate, and left with God alone. Faith depends on each one's conscience. Nothing ought to be so free as faith and religion, to which no one can be forced, since it is a divine work, wrought by God's spirit, and can be produced or expressed by no human power. Hence the well-known maxim of Saint Augustin—'No one should, no one can, be compelled to believe'; heretics cannot be restrained by any outward means. They must be dealt with by something else than the severity of the sword. The battle is to be fought with God's word. If you fail with that in your mouth, in vain will you try secular force though you fill all things with blood."

These truly Christian verities are the protestant confession of faith touching toleration. Would that all who have benefitted by Luther's heroism and so gained their own liberty, had followed Luther's example, and so been zealous for the liberty of others! Those protestants who consider their own opinions the only passport to heaven, being Romanist in thought, may easily become Romanist in spirit, and so indulge in persecution. Yet even they are controlled by a protestant principle, which finds fit utterance in the above cited words of Luther, for religion is an inward reality, an affair between each individual and his Maker, a life kindled and sustained by the hand of God himself. In such a matter man sinks into a mere instrument, and human forces can do no more than co-operate with the Divine Spirit. Actuated by this principle protestants have grown as in true Christian liberty so in true Christian liberality, and when they shall be wholly mastered and swayed thereby, they will be free in life and in heart as Christ was free. Freedom, in consequence, is their birth-right, their inheritance, their patrimony, which, enjoying it themselves severally, they cherish and transmit to their sons and their son's sons; so that illiberality is with them "a strange work," and persecution all but impossible. But in Romanism the employment of physical force is a first principle; an avowed if also an extreme instrument. If the truth of this statement did not shine forth from evidence already adduced, it would be made manifest by the following contradiction. Among the one and forty propositions of Luther's, which pope Leo V condemned in his famous bull *Exsurge, Domine*, published in 1520, is this one: "To burn heretics is contrary to the will of the Spirit." If now we put the proposition and the condemnation side

by side we shall have under our eyes in distinct lines—

THE PAPAL DOCTRINE OF PERSECUTION :

To burn heretics is AGREEABLE to the will of the Spirit.

THE PROTESTANT DOCTRINE OF TOLERATION :

To burn heretics is CONTRARY to the will of the Spirit.

Outlines of persecuting wars, in which the civil power was the instrument of the state, would be a natural sequence, and a suitable illustration of the statements made in this chapter. The affair is too painful. I confine myself to such particulars, respecting the massacre of Saint Bartholomew, as serve to exhibit therein the combination of lay and clerical agency. That butchery, which surpasses in guilt and horror even the crime of the sanguinary Nero in setting fire to pagan Rome, was committed on the 24th August (St. Bartholomew's day), 1572, by the French king Charles IX, instigated by his barbarous mother, Catherine de Medici. In Paris alone 4000 protestants perished, no few of whom were men of mark, rank, and influence, enticed into the capital to be slain. When all was ready, the king, awaking, proved irresolute. Then at midnight he received a visit from Catherine. "The moment is come," she said, "to cut out the gangrene. Cruel, say you? recall the words of the bishop of Bitonte, 'Religion may be cruel sometimes, but then cruelty is very religious.' Lose not so favourable an opportunity." The monarch fearing to be thought a poltroon, ordered the slaughter to begin. At half-past one—one hour and a half before the appointed time—the palace bell boomed forth the knell. "For God and the king," shouted the murderers as they fell on the defenceless protestants. Excited with brutal joy, Charles, as soon as the day dawned, seized a gun and began to fire on the objects of his hatred, incessantly shouting "kill

them ! kill them !” Weary of firing, the king leaned on the window sill of the Louvre, “when he took pleasure while he watched, struggling and drowning as they passed in the Seine below, more than four thousand persons wounded and slain.” A few days after Charles went to see the Admiral Coligny, who had been hung by his feet, and whose corpse began to be offensive. His attendants held their noses. “Why hold your noses ?” asked the monarch, “I do not hold mine ; the stink of an enemy’s body is very sweet.” He resolved to witness the dying agonies of two other protestants of distinction. It was night, and the night was dark. Therefore he had torches lighted, and made the attendants hold the torches near the gallows, that he might contemplate the countenances of his victims. Three entire days the streets ran with blood. Meanwhile orders had been despatched to destroy the protestants in the provinces. The mandate was in general too eagerly obeyed. One hundred thousand persons—men, women, and children—are said to have fallen in various parts of the country. On the 28th of the same month the king, in the presence of his great men and courtiers, solemnly declared that “what was done on the 24th August to punish so many guilty wretches, had been done by his orders.” The massacre was indeed the result of a general conspiracy on the part of Romanists, though the precise moment of its execution seems to have been kept by Catherine and her cruel son to themselves.

The news of the massacre was received by the two chiefs of the then catholic world, the pope and the king of Spain, with transports of joy. The latter, Philip II, wrote, a few days after he had received the intelligence, that it was “one of the greatest satisfactions he had experienced in his life,”

and he directed his ambassador to congratulate Charles on "a determination so honourable, Christian, and valiant." On the 17th of September he wrote to the queen mother, Catherine, "the just punishment which, by the order of the very Christian king, my brother, and your majesty, has been inflicted on the admiral (Coligny), on those of his sect and its partizans, is an act of equal courage and prudence, of great service for the glory and honour of God, and of universal utility for Christendom, and particularly for the king, my brother, and his interests, so that it is to me the best and most exhilarating news that could at present reach me. * * * In fine, your majesties have well shown to the world what you had in your hearts." Catherine replied, "I do not doubt that you feel as much as we the happiness granted us by God in giving the king, my son, the means to rid himself of subjects who were rebels equally to God and to him. By this proceeding we give evidence of our good and upright intentions, for we have devised it only for God's honour, and I rejoice still more in thinking that this opportunity will increase the friendship between your majesty and your royal brother," But Philip was not a man to be satisfied with half measures. He several times wrote to his ambassador to urge Charles and his associates to complete the work of extermination of the heretics throughout France, and repeatedly offered his services to aid them in the sanguinary work, "that they may drive heresy and heretics out of their kingdom, and establish the Roman catholic faith and the entire obedience which is due to the holy see. Toward this result tend all my thoughts and acts, as a son of the holy see, who, before all other things, desires to see its power preserved and augmented." Portugal rejoiced, like Spain, at the terrible

crime. A procession took place in Lisbon, in which the cardinal prince, Dom Henry, took part. Still more demonstrative was the joy of Rome. Its representative in Paris gave the signal. At the very moment he had, as he says, just seen everything with his own eyes, he, announcing the massacre to the cardinal secretary of state in Rome, declares, "From the bottom of my heart I rejoice with his holiness that it has pleased the divine majesty to conduct the affairs of his kingdom so happily and so honourably, having, at the beginning of his pontificate, so taken the king (of France) and the queen mother under his protection that they have been able to extirpate those poisoned hordes with so much prudence and at so opportune a moment, when all the rebels were locked up in their cage." The pope, Gregory XIII, went in a grand ceremonial procession from the church of Saint Mark to that of Saint Louis des Francais, where the Cardinal Lorraine said mass, including the *Te Deum*, in thanks to God, in the presence of the pontiff and thirty-three cardinals. A pompous inscription, commemorative of the event, was composed by the same cardinal, and placed over the entrance of the church. He also wrote to Charles to congratulate him on "those very Christian and heroic deliberations and executions." A commemorative medal* was also struck, bearing



* Number 22 of the medals struck in the reign of Gregory XIII, in the collection of the jesuit Bonanni; *Numismata Pontificum: Romae*, 1639, 2 vol., fol. i, p. 336.

the portrait of Gregory, having on the reverse a representation of a massacre, in the midst of which appears the destroying angel, with the concise but too expressive motto :

Extermination of the Huguenots.

Finally the pope commanded Vasari to paint three large *frescoes*, representing three principal scenes in the murderous Saint Bartholomew:—1st, the wounded Coligny carried to his home; 2nd, the king in council deciding on the massacre; 3rd, the massacre itself. These paintings still decorate three large and lofty panels in “the royal hall” of the Vatican, the walls of which are consecrated to perpetuate the triumphs of the Roman church over its enemies. What an instructive and painful fact !

As if he could not sufficiently express his satisfaction, the pope conferred on Charles the special favour of sending him the Rose of Gold—the rarest token of papal approbation. The legate who carried it, in passing through Lyons, found a number of people awaiting him on their knees. “These,” he was told, “are the brave ones who did the great deed.” He fervently gave them his benediction. Gregory also caused a celebrated French scholar, Marc Antoine Muret, to preach before him, when his paternal ears were saluted, among others, with these words: “O day full of happiness and delight—that in which you yourself, very holy father, received the news from France, and went in full solemnity to offer thanks to God Almighty and to the holy king of Louis; and in truth what more agreeable intelligence could be brought to you?” The catholic church took part in the satisfaction of its head. Cardinals, bishops, priests, monks, poured forth enthusiastic joy. The pulpits of Paris and all France resounded with commendations. The Metropolitan Chapter of Notre Dame de Paris ordered a

procession, in order to thank God for "the extirpation of heresy happily commenced." "Happily commenced!" as if to make it felt that the butchery was to be completed. The fanatical sermon preached by Panigarola, before Catherine, Charles IX, and his brother Henry, king of Poland, a month after the dreadful event, is still extant. In it the royal assassins are told that "in a single morning, the king, by merely opening his mouth, had purified all the population between the Garonne and the Alps, between the Rhone and the Rhine."*

Another scene: Astrologers had promised the ambitious queen mother that all her sons should be kings. A vacancy occurred in the throne of Poland. Her cherished son, the duke d' Anjou, must be placed in the empty seat. Now then came the necessity of tranquillising the horrified Protestant princes, without whose acquiescence success would be impossible. A Romanist bishop, by name Montluc, undertook the office. He, in the name of "the very Christian king" Louis IX, presented to the grandees of Poland the duke d' Anjou, as a candidate for the crown, at the same time publishing "An Apology of the duke d' Anjou against the calumnies of his foes," in which he excused the massacre of Paris on the ground that the protestants had brought it on themselves by their attacks, that the event was not premeditated, and that the duke, who was clemency itself, took no part therein, though in reality he had been the principal promoter of the plot. The falsehoods and

* I am indebted for the substance of the foregoing most important facts principally to a very instructive and calmly written Essay published in *Colant's* excellent *Revue de Theologie*; Numbers for September and October, 1859. The piece, drawn up from original documents, with equal care and judgment, by its cultivated author, *A. Coquerel*, jun., and rich in information scarcely less new than important, has just been issued in a separate form, and may be obtained through Mr. Nutt, bookseller, 270, Strand, London.

duping succeeded. The duke was elected king of Poland by a very large majority.

“The end sanctifies the means.”

Yet one scene more: Less than two years are gone, and Charles IX is on his death bed. He becomes aware that his end draws near. Then the remembrance of the murders he commanded, and the recollection of all that scene of horror which he enacted and contemplated from his window, firing on his subjects, and beholding the dead and dying hurried down the stream, tossing about in their agony, rise in frightful shapes, and with bitterest remorse in his soul. “The last night of his life,” says l’Etoile, “unable to rest, his nurse, whom, though a protestant, he loved, heard the king moan, weep, and sigh. She approached, when he said to her, sobbing and crying so that he could hardly speak, “Ah, my dear, my nurse, what blood! what murders! O! I followed bad advice. Merciful God, pardon me those crimes! have pity on me, I pray! I know not where I am, so agitated and perplexed do they make me.” Even the disease he sunk under seemed to retrace to his frightened imagination the great crime of his life:—blood, and nothing but blood, did he see around him. His spittle and phlegm were dyed with blood. He suffered also under the bloody flux. In extreme pain blood exuded from the pores of his skin. When at the worst he seemed all bathed in blood.

He died at the age of twenty-three years and eleven months, having reigned thirteen years and a half.

The Chancellor de Thou says, “He ate little; he slept little; and, from the Saint Bartholomew, his sleep was often interrupted by a shudder of horror, which seized him all of a sudden. To compose him to sleep again his pages sang.’

But for some time his pains were so sharp and so long that he could obtain no relief whatever.*

BE SURE YOUR SIN WILL FIND YOU OUT.—(Numb. xxxii, 23.)

SECTION II.

THE CONFESSIONAL—ITS BEARING TOWARD THE PRESS.

The Press!—is it not the source of our light, the foundation of our strength, the palladium of our liberties? To Englishmen the press is unutterably dear. No wonder: they have bled for its acquirement, they have suffered for its retention, they have struggled for its freedom, and they are ready to die rather than bid farewell to its advantages. At the present hour a free press is a power in Great Britain co-ordinate with the power of the parliament and the power of the crown. Co-ordinate with the parliament and the crown, the press instructs, directs, and in the final issue, governs the governors of the realm, and, with an ever-increasing ascendancy, bestows on Englishmen blessings domestic, social, and civil, the most ample, the most valuable, the most cherished. If, then, Rome is hostile to the press, Rome falls under their condemnation. That one fact, if fact it is, makes Rome an object of our aversion.

* The chief authority I have followed is "*Histoire des Français*," by J. C. L. Simonde de Sismondi, vol. xi. p. 374, seq. See, also, "*Les Nations Catholiques et les Nations Protestantes comparées*," par Napoleon Roussel. Paris, 1854, vol. ii, p. 397.

But Rome is hostile to the press. Rome wages war upon the press. Rome does her best to prevent, prohibit, and destroy all the productions of the press but such as speak on her own behalf and promote her own aggrandisement. This statement I proceed to justify.

Under the name of "religious indifferentism," Scavini, as well as Perrone, and other high authorities, denounce free enquiry and individual judgment, which are the foundation and the guarantee of a free press. "This," says the former, "is a very base species of private infidelity, and a pestiferous error of our age, against which it is the duty of the ministers of the church to fight manfully." After supporting his doctrine by the authority of pope Leo XII (1823) and pope Gregory XVI (1831), Scavini proceeds to lay down Rome's doctrine

ON THE READING OF PROHIBITED BOOKS.

Q. Has the church the power of prohibiting noxious books?—

A. "Among the numerous errors with which in our age the gates of hell have in vain endeavoured to fight against the true church of Christ, this one deserves special notice, namely, that the power of prohibiting noxious books does not belong to the church, and, therefore, that all books may be read by all with a safe conscience. This is the doctrine of the heretics. Catholic theologians in general teach it as a catholic dogma that the church, and on its behalf, the pope, as the Vicar of Christ and successor of Saint Peter, received from the Lord himself the right of forbidding the faithful to read books whether treating impiously of religion, or against sound morals, or against the discipline of the church. No one will dare to deny that by these words of scripture, "Feed my sheep, feed my lambs;"

“ feed the flock of God which is among you, attend to yourselves and the whole flock in which the Holy Spirit has placed you to rule the church of God ;” it is proved that to all the prelates of the church, and especially to their head, the supreme pontiff, power has been given of determining causes touching faith and morals, of indicating good pastures to the sheep of Christ, and of restraining them from entering such as are noxious ; for no one would account him a shepherd fit to feed sheep who could neither discriminate with certainty good from bad pastures, nor restrain his sheep from entering the bad. As scripture, so tradition, establishes this duty. Among innumerable witnesses we call Saints Augustin and Cyprian to give evidence ; the first demonstrates that the custom of taking precautions against bad books, and of burning them, proceeded from the apostles ; the second says ‘ Whatever things are written (that is, against sound morals) by the *calumniating boldness* of certain persons, we do not suffer them to be read.’ To the same effect usage gives its authority. Undoubted historical documents prove it to have been the constant custom in the church to destroy books injurious to faith or sound morals. Even in the age of the apostles ‘ many of those who followed curious arts brought their books and burnt them before all men.’ In the Nicene Council (325) the fathers condemned the books of Arius, and commanded them to be burnt ; in the Council of Ephesus (431) the writings of Nestorius were condemned ; in the Council of Chalcedon (451) the writings of Eutyches ; Saint Leo of Rome burnt the books of the Manichæans ; the same was done by Symmachus, Hormisdas, pope Nicholas I, pope Nicholas II, Leo X, and innumerable others. But after the art of printing was invented, about

the year 1450, by Guttenberg, the filth of noxious books increased immensely. In consequence, the Council of the Lateran, under Leo X (1515), decreed that thenceforth no printed book should be published except with the approbation of the bishops or the inquisitors, and appointed as punishment for the infraction of the ordinance not only excommunication and suspension from official duties, but the loss of all the books, and other penalties, at the will of the ordinary. Then under pope Paul IV (1555) there was made an Index (catalogue) of prohibited books, which pope Pius IV (1559), with the assent of the Council of Trent, augmented and improved. Finally, pope Pius V (1565) appointed a congregation (committee) of cardinals and of other members of the clergy, both regular and secular (monks and priests), with the express purpose that they should watch over published books, with the consent of the pope prohibit such as they thought injurious to catholics, and place them in "Index of Prohibited Books;" on which account it is called *the Congregation of the Index*, the word *Index* being used because it *indicates* noxious books. From this constant anxiety of all ages it sufficiently appears—to use the words of pope Gregory XVI (1831)—how very false, rash, and injurious to the apostolic see, and fertile with great evils to the flock, is the doctrine of them who not only reject the censorship of books as oppressive and burdensome, but have proceeded to that pitch of wickedness as to declare it contrary to the principles of equity, and dare to deny to the church the prerogative of legislating in the matter. Finally, natural reason attests the practice; for it is the voice of nature that books which do harm to religion and sound morals should be destroyed in every possible manner, since it can escape no one how

many evils they engender in religion itself and in civil society; for as wholesome reading fosters virtue, unwholesome reading impels to vice; whence in our penal code it is forbidden, under heavy penalties, either to introduce books into the kingdom, or to publish them, except they have been approved by the legitimate authorities, and with yet severer punishments, to attack in writing either morals or religion.

Q. But may he who is morally certain that he is in no danger of perversion read without permission prohibited books?
—A. By no means, for the aim of the prohibition is not only to keep the conscience from harm, but, most of all, to preserve in so perilous a matter the obedience due to the church; also, lest there be given to heretics and other dishonest writers a most pernicious handle for committing bad books to the press; and, indeed, in the pope's bull of prohibition it is said, *on no account nor under any pretext.*

Q. From whom is a license to read prohibited books to be obtained?
—A. Generally speaking from the supreme pontiff only, or from either the Congregation of the Inquisition or the Congregation of the Index. In cases of great necessity the bishop of the district may grant such license. For Rome and its district the privilege is awarded to the master of the Sacred Palace. This, however, is to be noticed, that he who has obtained the license is not to suppose that on that account he can read in safety, if he is unable to discriminate between one form of leprosy and another, and if he is a man of infirm purpose; because it is a law of nature that no one should commit himself to the peril of sinning.

Q. Do the prohibitions of books require the royal sanction?
A. No; because bulls and briefs which regard the dogmas of the faith, the rules of Christian life, and soundness of

morals, are expressly with us exempted from the royal jurisdiction, for what else do the prohibitions of books regard except the dogmas of the faith and sound morals?

Q. Of how many kinds are heretical books, and what concerning them?—A. Those books are placed in three different classes: the first class consists of the books of heretics, that is, books which contain heresy or treat of religion; the second, the books of any author which have been prohibited on account of heresy or the suspicion of false doctrine; the third, books which have been prohibited on other grounds, as for nameless and obscene things found in them, or things contrary to good morals, or things contrary to the good repute of others, &c. Books of the first class are, with reservation of the pope's jurisdiction, prohibited in the bull *Cœnæ* under the penalty of excommunication *ipso facto* incurred—the penalty falls on all who read, possess, print, or in any way defend and sell the books. Here, however, two things are to be noted—1st, that by the rules of the Index the books of heresiarchs are prohibited THOUGH THEY DO NOT TREAT OF RELIGION; 2nd, the books of heretics not being the heads of sects, are not prohibited if they in no way treat of religion, and are approved by catholic theologians by command of their superiors. Books of the second class are prohibited by the rules of the Index and the decrees of pope Pius IV, under the penalty of excommunication, but without special reservation of the pope's jurisdiction; under the same penalty books of magic also are prohibited, since they are considered as suspected of heresy. But the books of catholics are not prohibited which contain words cited from some heretic with a view to their confutation. Books of the third class are prohibited under an express penalty, but those who read or

possess them, besides incurring the guilt of mortal sin, are to be severely punished at the will of the bishop; yet ancient books, written by heathens, *which contain lascivious things, are, on account of their elegance, permitted, except to boys.*

Q. What is to be laid down respecting those who read the Bible in the vulgar tongue?—A. All know that a certain society called *The Bible Society*, founded at London about the year 1814, has been extended throughout the globe, and still daringly wanders abroad. The object of the society is, with the aid of public contributions, to translate the scriptures into the vulgar tongues of all nations. Hence, much it is to be feared lest by corruption or perverse explanation, the gospel of the Lord Christ be made into a gospel of man, or what is worse, “a gospel of the devil”—to use the words of a great doctor. Properly, therefore, have the Roman pontiffs employed all their power to destroy that society and condemn its publications; they are condemned, first by pope Pius VII, in his apostolic letters of June 1st and September 4th, 1816; next by Leo XII, in his Encyclic of the 3rd of May, 1824, who, moreover, by a special mandate in the year 1825, confirmed the command of Clement VIII, who revoked the permission which bishops might give of reading those books; also by Pius VIII, in his Encyclic of 24th May, 1829; and, lately, by Gregory XVI, in his Encyclic, May 8th, 1844, wherein he ratified all the ordinances of his predecessors.

Q. What is required for the Excommunication of those who possess, read, print, or defend the books of heretics?—A. First, that the author be a heretic, or at least that, if anonymous, he professedly treat of heresy; for then he is justly considered a heretic. It is, however, to be known that books

composed by Jews were condemned by the bulls of Pius V and Clement VIII; secondly, that the reading be done with knowledge, whence not only invincible but gross ignorance excuses from censure; thirdly, that the book treat of religion or contain heresy, and therefore, it suffices if it treats of religion though it contain no error; but a book is said to treat of religion if it treats of Sacred Scripture, of Theology, of the Canons of the Church, of the Rites of the Church, or of other spiritual things. If, on opening a book, your eye falls on something which directly opposes the faith, and you read, you will not escape excommunication, although you read only a few lines. You are not excused if the error has been expunged, because the book itself has been prohibited by the bull which prohibits all the books of heretics treating of religion. It makes no difference if the book has been translated into another tongue, for books forbidden in one language, into whatever language they are translated, are throughout the world accounted as interdicted and condemned under the same penalties. Thus was it determined by Clemens VIII, in an Instruction added to the rules of the Index, which the Sacred Congregation re-asserted, 4th March, 1828. No exception is made in favour of a sermon or a letter by a heretic, for in the Expurgatory Index issued by the Council of Trent all writings composed by heretics, though brief and not containing heresy, are expressly prohibited until they have been examined and approved. Nor are manuscripts excluded, for pope Benedict XIV comprehended manuscripts in the books which he prohibited. As to the hearing of an heretical book read, he who does so falls into sin, though he may not incur excommunication.

Q. To what are they held bound who possess prohibited books?

—A. According to the Constitutions (ordinances) of Pius IV (1559) he who possesses an heretical book is required to give it up as soon as possible to the Inquisitors or the bishops; and Alexander VII (1655) proscribed this proposition, namely, ‘prohibited books may be retained while they are purified.’ Heretical books are to be given up, for although he is commonly excused from censure who burns a forbidden book, because he thus ceases to possess the book, the command is that the book be given up. The book must be given up as soon as possible. He indeed is excused from censure who retains a book a day or two, even if in that interval he has the intention of keeping the book perpetually; but he is not excused who retains a prohibited book belonging to some one else, for example, in trust, on loan, in pledge; nor he who gives a book to be kept for him by another, since he can obtain it when he pleases—except in the case when a person puts a prohibited book into the hands of one who has a license to have such book, and with the express agreement not to claim its restoration, until after its expurgation, or after the procuring of a license to that effect.”*

Safely, then, may I now make the following statements :

- 1.—Rome avowedly prevents, prohibits and destroys all books and parts of books but such as she approves.
- 2.—Rome approves no books but such as speak on her behalf and promote her views.
- 3.—Rome permits her adherents to read only such writings and publications as directly and unmistakably teach her doctrines and espouse her objects.
- 4.—Rome proscribes the religious literature of all Christendom except her own.

* “*Theologia Moralis Universa in usum Clericorum; Auctore Petro Scavini; Editio Altera*,” 1847-8: vol. ii, p. 154, seq.

5.—Rome conducts this crusade against the religious literature of the Greek Church and the Protestant Church on the ground that in so doing she performs an imperative obligation.

6.—This Crusade Rome has conducted from early ages down to the present hour.

Am I not justified in declaring that Rome is an avowed enemy of the Press, and that Rome and a free press cannot exist together? As then Rome prevails, the press is restricted. Should Rome become predominant, a free press would cease to exist.

Before we pass to some particulars illustrative of our subject, we wish to mark distinctly the principle which underlies the warfare of Rome against Free Thought. This principle she brands with the name of "religious indifference." Happily she herself has given a definition, and, hence, we learn that this anathematised pravity is nothing else than that individual freedom of thought and speech which is the corrolate and necessary implication of individual responsibility. Here, then, is an open avowal that to think for yourself and to judge for yourself, and to declare your convictions, are heretical and damnable acts. This universal proscription of mental liberty has, however, one exception. You may "mark, learn, and inwardly digest," provided you decide in favour of Rome. You are so far free that you may disposses yourself of your freedom. Your intelligence is valid enough to pronounce its own invalidity. So palpably inconsistent and self-contradictory is Rome's logical position.

In order the more certainly to make their prohibitions effectual it is ordained by the Congregation of the Index as follows:—"In every city and diocese the house or places

where the art of printing is carried on, and also the shops of booksellers, shall be frequently visited by persons deputed for that purpose by the bishop or his vicar, conjointly with the Inquisitor of heretical pravity, so that nothing that is prohibited may be printed, kept, or sold. Booksellers of every description shall keep in their libraries a catalogue of the books which they have on sale, signed by the said deputies; nor shall they keep or sell, nor in any way dispose of, any other books, without permission from the deputies, under pain of forfeiting the books, and being liable to such other penalties as shall be judged proper by the bishop or inquisitor, who shall also punish the buyers, readers, or printers of such works. If any person import foreign books into any city, he shall announce them to the deputies; or if this kind of merchandize be exposed to sale in any public place, the public officers of the place shall signify to the said deputies that such books have been bought; and no one shall presume to give to read, or lend, or sell, any book which he or any other person has brought into the city until he has shown it to the deputies, and obtained their permission, unless it be a work well known and universally allowed."*

Seavini expressly includes in his proscription the Bible Society and the translations which it has put into circulation. The point is so important as to merit a little more attention. These are the teachings of Perrone on the subject:—"With good reason did the Council of Trent determine and declare that of all the Latin versions of the sacred books in circulation the ancient Vulgate translation is alone to be accounted of authority. On the best grounds have the Roman pontiffs in spiritual decrees condemned as

* Tenth Rule of the Index.

noxious and baneful the societies which bear the name of Biblical. The reading of Sacred Scripture by members of the church generally is by no means necessary to salvation. Never has the church or the popes universally prohibited to the faithful the reading of the bible in the Vernacular, but now disallowed, now allowed it according as regard to time, place, or person, as well as the benefit of the faithful seemed to demand.* This statement, that Rome has never universally prohibited the reading of the bible in the vernacular offers a specimen of the subtle casuistry with which it is accustomed to convey a false impression without openly contracting the guilt of positive falsehood. What Rome does is to proscribe as inaccurate this translation and that. All then that she needs to make her condemnation practically universal is vigilance and hyper-criticism. In these qualities she is not deficient. Accordingly she proscribes every version which she thinks proper to proscribe. But proscription may be indirect as well as direct. With a church whose sanction is required for every book read omission is proscription. Do, then, the bishops indicate versions in place of those which they brand as falsified? Nothing of the kind. No French version has been thus sanctioned, and the French is the language of more than fifty millions of catholics. In English it is true there is what is called the Douay Version; but this version is allowed expressly on the ground that "it is very useful for propagating and supporting the catholic faith."† Nor could it be recommended as being a faithful image of the sacred originals, if only because it is made from the Latin Vulgate

* II, p. 1154 seq.

† See the *Approbatio* prefixed to "The Holie Bible," &c., "by the English College of Douay," 1609.

—Rome's own text—instead of being translated from the Hebrew and the Greek. Besides this most serious defect the Vulgate abounds in errors and falsifications. Yet they cannot be removed, for the Council of Trent, combined with the popes, has sanctioned the edition of the Vulgate, which appeared in 1592, as of such authority that on no pretext is it to be rejected by any one. These errors, accordingly, every catholic is bound not to see, or, if he sees them, to deny their existence. This is one of the unenviable positions to which the infallibility of the church leads. Error is of course error; but you must not acknowledge the error, for the church cannot err; and if fact prevails with you over theory, you will, for your honesty, be punishable by church censures, if not by civil penalties.

The system of mental coercion already described is sustained by Indexes of two kinds. Of these one is "The Index of Prohibited Books;" the other, "The Expurgatory Index." The second, sometimes united with the first, sometimes not, is intended to purify books, which, when purified, are allowed to be read, from everything objectionable, and, accordingly, contains a particular examination of the works which it reviews, and specifies the passages condemned to be expunged or altered. The Spanish Indexes of this kind are voluminous. In these publicity is sedulously guarded against, because as containing the offensive matter, their diffusion would openly spread the venom. On the other hand Protestants have not failed to profit by the opportunity thus afforded them of putting forth to the public in re-prints the matter which Rome had confessedly found it easier to proscribe than to answer. The publication of this matter had, for the opponents of Rome, the additional advantage of displaying, in an unmistakeable

form, the great and numerous diversities of doctrine which prevail in the bosom of a church which makes unity one of the principal signs and proofs of its divine origin and authority.

The first Index specifies and prohibits entire authors or works. This book has been frequently published, with successive enlargements, up to the present time, under the express sanction of the reigning pontiff; and may be considered as a kind of periodical publication of the papacy. No attempt to prevent its circulation is discoverable, and it may be obtained through the booksellers. The Prohibitory Index has appeared in different countries, and in many editions. With some variations and continual additions these are in the main copies of the Roman Index published, by authority, in Rome, in the year 1559. A reprint and continuation of this work lies before me, having for title—*Index Librorum Prohibitorum Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Gregorii XVI, Pontificis Maximi jussu editus; Romæ, 1841*—"The Index of Prohibited Books, published by the command of our most holy lord, Gregory XVI,* supreme pontiff; Rome, 1841." Successive decrees form an appendix, which bring down the prohibitions to the year 1857. A characteristic engraving precedes the title page, and declares the aim and spirit of the volume. Immediately under the arms of the papacy, in which the keys of universal empire and the tiara are conspicuous, is a large blazing fire, into which persons are, on one side, casting books, while, on the other, stand officers of justice, the foremost of whom bears a sword in his left hand, while with his right he is directing the combustion over which he

* He reigned from 1831 to 1846, and was succeeded by the present pope, Pio Nono.

presides. At the bottom you read a motto in these words : " Many of those who had followed curious arts brought their books and burnt them before all men : Acts xxx, 19." The volume is in quarto, of about 500 pages, and contains about 26,000 volumes. Well has it been said that a complete library might be formed out of the books which have been put under the papal ban. A survey of some of the editions of the Index discloses facts which illustrate the working of this slavish and iniquitous system.

In 1624 a Portugese Index made its appearance, the spirit of which, and therein the spirit of Rome, is portrayed in the title page and the title. It is a portly volume of more than 1000 pages—a sort of Roman three-decker. The title page is engraved and ornamented in a manner Romanistically imposing. In the centre of the top you see the arms of the Inquisition. Let the reader mark what they are—a cross between an olive branch and a sword. The devise may receive a translation in the Mohamedan war cry, " Death to unbelievers !" It means literally, *The olive branch if you will, the sword if you wont* ; or, in other words, " Here is your sole option—the olive branch or the sword." Toward the bottom, on one side, is a Vine with a dead branch, to which an axe is applied, with the motto " that it may bring forth more fruit," and with the injunction " Cast it into the fire ;" between them are the cardinals' hat and arms. The title is peculiarly rancorous, alas ! not impotently so then and there. " The Index of authors damned to infamy,"* gives enough as a specimen of the venom. The edict of the Inquisitor commands all persons, whether ecclesiastic or laic, who may possess the condemned books, within thirty days after the publication

* Index Auct. damanatæ Memoræ, &c., 1624.

of the Index, to deliver or signify them to the Inquisitor of the district; offenders render themselves subject to the greater excommunication, and to be proceeded against as persons of suspected faith; the same penalty awaits book-sellers or others selling or importing the books; and the vendors of other books condemned for causes short of heresy, besides the guilt of mortal sin, become liable to severe chastisement at the discretion of the general and other inquisitors; while the licenses to have or read prohibited books formally granted are revoked.

The power to give effect to the mandates of the Index, and especially to execute its penalties, depends on the ascendancy which the pope exercises in each particular country. It is a catholic doctrine that while the pope in these matters is independent of the magistrate, the magistrate, who does not bear the sword in vain, is bound to inflict the penalties ordained by the pope. If the pope had his own, that is, if he possessed the prerogatives which he claims, the magistrate would be simply his gaoler and executioner. In the degree in which the pope gains ascendancy his punishments are as certain as severe. Thus, in Spain Philip II published a sanguinary decree denouncing death and confiscation of goods against all who should buy, sell, or keep any books prohibited by the Sacred Office, and to preclude the pretence of ignorance, ordered a catalogue, prepared by the Inquisitor-General, to be published in 1558. This act was enforced by one more atrocious, published by the same "Catholic King" in 1570, and addressed to the sanguinary duke of Alva, ordaining that within three months after the publication of the statute, all the condemned books should be burned, and all possession or sale of them be unlawful: also, that all books condemned or

appointed to be expurgated should be brought to the magistrate of the place, and be corrected according to the judgment of a commission appointed for the purpose. The list of prohibited books comprises works in Latin, French, Dutch, and Spanish. To put printing-houses and booksellers' shops under the suspicious and vigilant eye of the Inquisition was to take the most effectual means possible, in order to cut off the infected streams of heretical water. Hence severe penalties were enjoined against infractions of the ordinances. Certain "Mandates," which follow the Spanish Index of 1612, denounce against offending tradesmen, for the first transgression, suspension from the rites of the church, loss of trade for two years, banishment twelve miles from the town where he dwells, and a fine of 1200 ducats; and for the second, double, with other punishments at the will of the Inquisitor; and, with other things, to crown the whole, ignorance is not to be admitted as an excuse.

Though emanating from a church which boasts of its unity, and founds its intended universal empire on its alleged infallibility, several editions of the Index betray marked and undeniable contrarieties. With certain prescribed precautions, licenses are issued under the authority of the pope, allowing, in certain cases, the reading of certain heretical books. Appended to an Index published at Madrid, in 1612, and again in 1614, is a brief of pope Paul V, which, lamenting the increase of the license and the mischief likely to follow, formally withdraws and annuls them all, forbidding the possession, sale, and reading of prohibited books, under the severest penalties, and under the same, commanding disclosure in all such cases as may be known, and when necessary, an appeal to the secular

arm. What token of unity is there in saying and unsaying the same thing, and how does infallibility consist with proscribing its own ordinations? The Index Expurgatorius set forth in 1571, by the duke of Alva, in Belgium, gives an example of the method in which catholic authorities correct, and in correcting, contradict each other. The Fathers to whom they are so fond of appealing contain things which they do not like. These offensive passages they transfixed in their Indexes appended to editions of the Fathers which they published. The Index just mentioned contains matter of the sort. The critique on Bertram's work on Transubstantiation* affords a specimen within our compass. The orthodox critics are almost equally troubled to dismiss and to retain him; but, on the whole, preferring the latter, they exert all their ingenuity to transubstantiate his suspected heterodoxy into orthodoxy, and in the outset divulge a principle of criticism of extreme use to themselves, but very perilous to their repute when published. These are their words translated literally: "In other ancient Catholics we bear very many errors, and extenuate, excuse, nay, by *devising a comment often deny them, and, when they are opposed, construe for the writers a suitable sense*; we do not see why Bertram does not merit the same equitable course." The method by which they extricate their incautious brother is by the logical legerdemain of a distinction between the species and accidents on the one side, and the substance on the other; and by the due application of which it is impossible to be a heretic as to the Eucharist, in the Roman sense, acknowledging, meanwhile, that Bertram does not appear to have been acquainted with the subtlety. Time, however, which revises all things, revises even infallible

* "*Bertrami de Corpore et Sanguine Domini.*

judgments. Accordingly, in the Index which is now current in the church Bertram is quietly and expressly condemned. Thus Bertram, one of "the Fathers," is suspected, corrected, excused, approved, and finally condemned. Still one of "the Fathers" is not condemned, for thus speaks the jesuit Gretser: "Although Bertram is prohibited, I deny that a Father is prohibited. For he is called a father of the church who feeds and nourishes it with salutary doctrine, who, being placed over the family of the Lord, gives it a portion of corn in due season. If, therefore, instead of the food of salutary doctrine and the portion of corn, he offers and distributes cockle and and tares, the burs and briars of false doctrines, so far he is not a father but a step-father, not a doctor, but a seductor." Who then are the Fathers? The Fathers, according to these proceedings, are certain ancient ecclesiastical writers who, when their writings are revised and expurgated, are styled Fathers by Rome, and so appealed to in proof of Romanism. That is, the popes make the evidence on which they rely. Truly this is Cæsar appealing to Cæsar. In other terms, it is assumption resting on jugglery.

The nature and extent of the revisions effected in "the Fathers of the Church," in order to make them suit and serve the purposes of Rome, may be judged by the following selections, being *erasures* ordered to be made in the Index to St. Chrysostom's works, printed by Frobenius. To save space, I give the condemned passages only in an English translation:

Positions of Chrysostom condemned by Rome.

- 1.—The doctrine of the Apostles is easy and intelligible to all.
- 2.—We are justified by faith alone.

3.—Christ forbids heretics to be put to death.

4.—Our salvation depends on the will of God, and not on our merit.

5.—The Reading of the Scriptures is necessary for all.

6.—Nothing can bind or loose after this life.

These, it will be seen, are propositions which contradict prominent Roman dogmas, and as equally favour leading positions put forward by Protestants. Chrysostom then speaks protestantism. What is to be done? Expurgate him. He is expurgated, and the expurgated Chrysostom becomes a Romanist!—a victory more easy than durable, and unutterably discreditable.

But the contents of her Index put Rome in direct antagonism with the great lights of the civilized world. Among its condemned authors we find the names which are most distinguished in the several departments of knowledge. Not only in religion and theology, but in the sciences, Rome here acknowledges by her own lips, that the first men are her adversaries. This is an important fact; let us establish it. A few instances must suffice. In theology, what greater names than Wycliffe, Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Cranmer, Parker, Sherlock, Tillotson, Usher, Whitgift, Whitby, Grabe, Outram, Pearson, Polus, Prideaux, Simon, Turretin, Abauzit, Michaelis? Yet these are all proscribed. In general scholarship, the writings of the following men are tacitly declared to be incompatible with the safety of the papal throne, namely, Scaliger, Walton, Buxtorf, Cardan, Campanella, Savonarola, Picard, De Dieu, Fleury, Hottinger, Lightfoot, Mead, Selden, Stephens, Scapula, Van Dale, Castalio, Dupin, Henry More, Bayle, Cudworth. Nor do the historians escape. Of eminent historians, there stand in the Index, branded as

heretical and false—Gibbon, Ginguené, Guicciardini, Bayle, Hallam, Burnet, Robertson, Hume, Sismondi, Llorente, Salvador, De Potter, Vertot, Villiers, Goldsmith, Raynal, Burnet, Maimbourg, Millot, Mosheim, and others. The philosophers, as might be expected, meet with no mercy. Of them there are proscribed—Bacon, Bentham, Pascal, Malebranche, Occam, Puffendorf, Leibnitz, Des Cartes, Condorcet, Darwin, Helvetius, Hobbes, Fontenelle, Hume, Locke, Kant, &c. Defenders of Christianity have their representatives in the Index, in the persons of Grotius, Addison, and Soame Jenyns. Newton leads the astronomers. Swift, Steele, Lady Morgan, are among the martyrs of polite literature; and the poets suffer in the persons of Alfieri, Dante, Boccacio, La Fontaine, Beranger, and Milton. How “Pamela” can have offended the Holy Office we know not; but here, in the Index, a sort of theological Lady Godiva, does that virtuous lady stand exposed. Even the innocuous Benjamin of Tudela has in some way merited the pontifical pillory. And while the wise and holy men of the Congregation have found heretical pravity in such grave writers as Baronius, Basnage, and Bull, they have thrown the veil of their authority over the profligate lives of such as Madame de Maintenon and Ninon de l’Enclos. Proscribing Protestantism as a mass of falsehood, they condescend to an express condemnation of the minor sectarians in the persons of Socinus and Barclay. Unitarians, of course, receive the honour of papal condemnation. Beginning with the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*, the Index brands Acontius, Abauzit, two of the Crells, Davidis, Denck, Locke, Ochín, Sandius, Servetus—not to mention others. Indeed, with an anticipatory resemblance to the steam engine, the inquisitors

are capable at once of the greatest and the smallest efforts, and with equal ease, condemn the Magdeburg Centuriators and detect an heretical film in Victor Hugo, like a fly caught in amber.

Such, then, is the Roman Index; and such is a specimen of the works which it holds up to infamy. In the very act an issue is joined of the highest consequence, not only to Rome, but to the world at large. That issue is this—the Sacred Congregation of the Index against the intelligence of their race. We say the intelligence of their race, for nothing less than that is represented in the condemned names which appear in the pages of the Index, and which, in part, have been cited in preceding lines. In order that the nature of the issue may be exactly understood by the reader, let him be on his guard against the delusion that lurks under the general term, “the Congregation of the Index.” This is simply a committee of some twenty persons. In a protestant point of view it is this and nothing more. Let it be supposed that, contrary to the general rule of public business, which is always apt to fall into the hands of one or two, the whole of the board attends its several sittings, and that every member reads a work before he gives his vote; and let it also be supposed that the supreme pontiff himself peruses the books on which he pronounces the final condemnation, then, in support of a decree of the Congregation, there are the opinions of some score of individuals. They shall be learned, good, and pious men. We will not urge the perverting and discolouring effect of their position. We will suppose them free from the sway of self-interest, and undisturbed by passion. We will let their educational prepossessions go for nothing. Twenty “good men and true”—twenty Christians of sound

minds and pure hearts, and varied learning—agree in giving a testimony against Newton's doctrine on "light colour, and attraction," or Brucker's "History of Philosophy." What is the worth of such a verdict? Does that verdict set aside the laws of reflection and refraction? When the inquisition compelled Galileo to pronounce the earth stationary, was not the aged astronomer right in declaring—*aside*, as the play-goers have it—"It does move for all that?" And is not the decision of the learned men of all nations and all faiths, except the catholic, in favour of Brucker, sufficient to outweigh the condemnation of the Index Committee? In many of the proscribed names, it is the judgment of the world at large that opposes the judgment of the Congregation. Could the competent judges of the whole earth be polled, how vast the majority that would reverse the sentence which placed Bacon, Locke, and Bentham, in the Index. In some sense the poll has been taken. Witness the return in the universal popularity of these writers. Where can you go in the civilized world without finding copies of their works? and who but they are the great authorities in the several topics of which they treat? Tacitly a verdict has been given: the pope against the *Novum Organon*. Every one knows the judgment. We say, then, that the papacy in the Index furnishes means for its own condemnation. The Index shows that for the last three hundred years, the greatest minds in the world have been opposed to Rome. The voice of intelligence condemns popery, for popery itself proves that it has enemies, not friends, in the chief representatives of that voice. On which side, then, will the reader take his stand? On which side will the final victory be? What is the logical value of that infallibility which is denied by the

greatest poets, philosophers, historians, and theologians of the last three centuries.

The Catholic may reply, that the twenty members of the Index are guided by the spirit of God. How does he know that? Is this more than a groundless assumption? If the Saviour's rule is admissable—"By their fruits shall ye know them"—then the contents of the Index condemn its authors. And where is the spirit of God more likely to be found? On the side of some twenty priests?—or on the side of the great lights of the human race? Besides, could it be the spirit of God which condemned Newton's "Optics"—a work which is now universally received as a demonstration of the Creator's modes of acting in one province of his universe? But we go further, and affirm, what all impartial men will approve, namely, that the members of the Congregation were likely to be under the control of a spirit far inferior to the spirit of God, seeing that they were judges in their own case. In most instances it was their own credit, their own creed, their own influence, their own position, their own wealth, that was at stake. Under such circumstances, an adverse judgement was altogether to be expected. Surely even catholics cannot be insensible to such considerations. Let them, then, observe the contrast there is between the twenty jurors of the Index and the many thousands who have borne, and are daily bearing, the clearest and the fullest evidence against their fundamental principles and their habitual practice.

Those, however, who are familiar with the proceedings of the court of Rome, know very well that the purity of motive, the high-mindedness, and the solid learning, for which we have given the Index Committee credit, are not the ordinary springs of action in the Vatican. Of corrupt courts

the court of Rome is most corrupt. Foreign influence, intrigue, and bribery, hold the first rank among its moving powers. We will prove our assertion by an instance. Among the names recorded in the Index stands that of the virtuous, benevolent, amiable, and pious Archbishop Fenelon. How came this to pass? In the face of a voluptuous and licentious court, Fenelon published a work, his "*Explication des Maximes des Saints*," which, from the pure, lofty, and angelic tone of its religion, was a real, though not intended, reproach to the king and his courtiers. Already had those Sybarites commenced a crusade against the spiritual doctrines set forth in the *Explication*, by assailing, incarcerating, and eventually worrying to death, Madame Guion, with whom these doctrines first found expression. Required to join in persecuting that amiable enthusiast, Fenelon, like a true man and a faithful Christian, stood firmly by her side, and did his best to ward off the poisoned arrows that were aimed against her. This fidelity earned for him the active hostility of the king, Louis XIV, of his paramour, Madame de Maintenon, and of the celebrated Bossuet, the friend and adviser of both. Actuated by the lowest passions, they raised the cry of heresy against Fenelon, and spared no pains until they succeeded in causing his book to be condemned by "the Sacred Congregation of the Index." It was not an easy task. The pope, Innocent XII, was averse to the condemnation of the book. At the first voting the cardinals were equally divided; and it was only by dint of artifice, intrigue and threats, that the French court overcame the court of Rome. Nay, such was the repugnance of the pope and other eminent personages in Rome, that they yielded only to the extreme step taken by Louis XIV, in

threatening, if his wish for Fenelon's condemnation was not complied with, to renounce the papal authority, and, like Henry VIII, set up a church on his own account. What spirit was it that actuated proceedings such as these?

The heretical pravity of Fenelon consisted in a high, if somewhat mystic, spirituality. Scarcely greater has been the offence of other authors who have fallen under the censure of the Romish Church. Indeed, like the good word of a bad man, it is only her praise that consistent friends of the gospel should fear. In the beginning of the seventeenth century Antonio de Dominis published a work entitled "*De Republica Ecclesiastica*." The work was burnt by the inquisition, as well as censured by the theological faculty of Paris. Happily the author was dead; but sacerdotal malice outlives its victims. The body of Antonio was exhumed and committed to the fire, together with the work. What was the offence? The volumes (three, in folio) contained principles of toleration and maxims favourable to the independence of secular princes. Reliable authorities speak of the author as one of the most illustrious victims of the inquisition, and as a learned man occupied with the project of bringing about a union of Christian communions. Carranza, catholic archbishop of Toledo, does everlasting penance in the Index for having written what he terms a "*Christian Catechism*," (1558.) The work was at first approved by the inquisition; then it was censured; then pronounced harmless by the Council of Trent (1563,) and finally excommunicated. In which of these acts was the church infallible? Carranza was a model of patience. Apprehended in 1559, by order of "the holy office" in Spain, he remained in prison there during eight years; then he was conveyed to Rome, where

his incarceration was longer and more severe. He was put on his trial in 1576, and though convicted of no certain heresy, was required to recant. The same year he died. The people, despising his oppressors, kept the day of his interment as a holy day, and honoured his corpse as that of a saint. The learning of Dupin is universally known. His "*Bibliothèque Universelle*" has a place in the Index. The following are "the errors" which occasioned this honour:—1. The author invalidates the worship of hyperdulia, which the church pays to the Mother of God; 2. He favours Nestorianism; 3. He weakens the proof of the primacy of the holy see; 4. He ascribes to the Fathers errors regarding the immortality of the soul and the eternity of the pains of hell; 5. He speaks of the Fathers with too little respect, &c. Palearius, in the early part of the sixteenth century, professor of Greek and Latin at Sienna, at Lucca, and at Milan, was in the last city arrested by the order of Pius V, and carried to Rome. Put on his trial, he was found guilty of having spoken in favour of the Lutherans, and in terms of disrespect against the inquisition. As a punishment, he was hung, strangled, and burnt at Rome in 1566. While the papacy proscribed works of learning, and stopped tongues with the halter, it feared raillery, saw peril in a joke, and so put under its ban Erasmus's "*Eulogium of Folly*" and the "*Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*."

The Index, moreover, is a standing proof of its own futility. Of all the books which it brands, how many having in themselves a principle of life, have fallen into desuetude and oblivion? Works of small ability the papacy could afford to disregard; and works of great ability it has not even by the Index been able to suppress. What does

its proscription of the works of the great ecclesiastical reformers manifest, save its inane and harmless malice? Truly a *Brutum Fulmen* is this Index—a *telum imbelle sine ictu*. The old lion here opens his jaws in wrath, but only to show that he has no teeth. Milton is still read, though here proscribed. With Voltaire the Congregation carried on a constant war. As fast as he published books they hastened to put them into the Index. Did their zeal hinder the spread of Voltaire's writings, or retard for a day the first terrible French Revolution?

Nay, rather, the Index was the best advertisement which infidelity could desire. The celebrated "Encyclopédie" of Diderot and Dalember was assailed by the ruling powers. Proscription was tried; the efficacy of the Index was put into request. A universal excitement ensued. The forbidden work was everywhere sought after. All must possess, if not read, that which was on every one's lips. The restrictions were of necessity removed, and an immense impulse given to the circulation. If the philosophers had expressly engaged Satan to aid them in their work, they could not have acted more for their purpose than did the Congregation of the Index. In fact, no advertisement is of value equal with that which is given by an ecclesiastical denunciation. The only thing that heretics should deprecate is silence and neglect.

But Rome attempts to extort a justification from Scripture. Does not the Bible record how bad books were burnt at Ephesus? (Acts, xix. 19.) What an impudent appeal is this! Yes, such a record is in the book of the Acts of the Apostles; but it speaks of a deed the very opposite of that in justification of which Rome makes the reference. The act there is voluntary—purely voluntary; coercion is

the essence of what Rome does. The growth of the word of God in Ephesus had dissolved the corrupt charms of magic, which men and women by thousands had come to regard as a deadly cheat, and therefore of their own accord did they bring their magical formularies of all kinds, in which had been their hope, to sacrifice them in a burnt offering on the altar of their new, real, living, and saving faith. The parallel of this act would have been, that the Encyclopædists having, by the power of reason and the force of Scripture, been convinced that Rome was identical with Christianity, and that Christianity was of God, came forward spontaneously, and said, "These volumes which we have written are hostile to God and deadly to man; in your presence, O Supreme Pontiff, we make them a holocaust; thus perish everything that impeaches your infallibility, or threatens to disturb your throne." Instead of converting unbelievers, Rome first incarcerates, and then—when she can—burns them; she silences heretics, and says they are confuted; her answer to an accusation is the Index. Out of the hands of her assailants she wrests their weapons, and, having consigned them to the flames, shouts "Victory," exclaiming in justification, "Thus did the apostle Paul." Great need has such a fraudulent teacher to make it a fundamental doctrine, that her pupils shall take Scripture in that sense, and that sense only, which is put upon it by the church. Great need has she to make the rule by which she is to be judged. Otherwise, as in the case before us, by Scripture her arts and practices must be condemned. But then, what is the logical value of such an appeal? scriptural evidence? the word and the will of God? Say, rather, thy own word, thy own will, given in evidence. Rome, thou corruptest thy judge; thou dictatest

the verdict; thou thy thyself hast written "acquittal," when truth and justice demanded "condemnation."

Beyond a doubt, the primitive church encouraged the freest use, as of speech, so of books. The old Hebrew literature was everywhere the subject of unrestricted appeal, in the claims of the earliest teachers of the gospel on men of Hebrew blood. Not much versed in Hebrew literature were the apostles, but Paul's example shows that, so far from being shunned, denounced, and destroyed, pagan authors were brought forward to give evidence for God and Christ. As separate Christian Scriptures came into existence, they were sent to the churches for whom they were designed, were intercommunicated between churches in different parts of the world, were treasured up, copied, diffused; were collected, and eventually made into one great whole; which in combination with the older Scriptures, became, in time, the great spiritual treasure of Christendom, the common rallying point, the one universally-recognised and reverently-honoured court of appeal. In and by unqualified mental and spiritual liberty was the church of Christ founded and established in the world. That liberty must be restored where it has been taken away, and maintained where it exists, otherwise the gospel cannot "have free course and be glorified." But freedom in the church is death to Rome.

Let Protestants be consistent; let them be Protestants indeed; let them revere in act, as well as word, "the sufficiency of Holy Scripture." Let there be no Protestant index of prohibited books. Let there be no Protestant shackles and cramps for the human mind. If, as they ought to do, Protestants hate Rome as the abomination of abominations, let them take good heed lest, by Romish

practices, they do the work and promote the cause of Rome; lest they prepare a people for a Rome; and lest, deserting the Lord Jesus Christ, they send others, if they go not themselves, into the arms of the Pope. Never since the days of Luther was there an era, when it was more important that the friends of Christianity as it is in Christ, should learn exclusively of him, follow him implicitly whithersoever he leads, and at the same time study to be “of one heart and one soul.”

SECTION III.

THE CONFESSIONAL;—THE JESUITS.

The agents of an institution go far to determine its character, for principles, to no small extent, depend for their effects on the manner of their execution. Who are the agents of the Confessional? In general, the Romish priests; in particular, the jesuits.* The name excites suspicion in the mind of an Englishman—not without reason. Bad as the Confessional is in itself it becomes worse as the field of jesuitical agency.

Founded in 1534, by Ignatius Loyola, generally for the propagation of the faith, and specially for the conversion of infidels and heretics, particularly such as had been called into existence by Luther and his band of reformers, “the Company of Jesus” received in 1540 the sanction of pope Paul III. Setting on foot a minutely ramified organ-

* See *Die Propaganda; ihre Provinzen und ihr Recht*; von Otto Meier; 2 vols., 8vo, Göttingen, 1852-3.

ization, the society extended its influence from Rome, as a centre, into every Christian country, and over distant barbarous lands, acquiring and exerting a dominion over human minds and human interests, paralleled by no other earthly power. Becoming after a while incompatible with existing authorities in church and state, it was everywhere proscribed and its members banished: in England in 1581 and 1601; in France, in 1594 and 1762; in Portugal, in 1598 and 1759; in Russia, in 1717 and 1817; in China, in 1753; in Spain and Sicily, in 1767; and at last the society was suppressed by the pope himself (Clement XIV) in 1773. Though thus put under the ban of their fellow-men and fellow-believers, the jesuits, sometimes under their own name, sometimes under other names, continued to exist and to labour in several countries, particularly in Russia, where they found an asylum under the empress Catherine II. Indeed, the burning fagots were not extinguished, but merely scattered. In their dispersion the Society of Jesus maintained their organization, and propagated their influence as far as they were able, employing all the resources they could put in motion in order to recover their lost position, until at length, in the year 1814, they were solemnly re-established by pope Pius VII. Since that event jesuitism has been actively at work in all European states. Proceeding on its avowed principle, "Faith knows no mother country," it makes itself a home everywhere; but a home where domestic and national ties are unknown or disallowed; and ever seeking, as its chief aim, the advancement of its own power, has had a very large share in the changes and convulsions of the last quarter of a century, and especially of the last ten years. Restored at a time when despotism was universally triumphant in

Europe, it was welcomed by several princes as a means of opposing the growing liberalism of the day ; yet even in catholic countries the fears of some rulers overcame their hopes, and they refused to receive the jesuits, though in his bull (*sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum*) the pope had ventured to declare that their re-establishment was unanimously called for by the faithful ; while other sovereigns, finding that the order soon grew too powerful and very troublesome, felt themselves obliged from a regard to their own authority, to withdraw their protection and expel its members from their dominions. In defeat, as in victory, however, jesuitism maintained its existence, clung to its objects, and unswervingly sought their realization. Banished, the brethren at once took measures for their return. Admitted into a state, they forthwith began to lay their foundations strong and deep ; proscribed, they changed their outward appearance and laboured on in silence ; tolerated, they spared no effort that they might rule and oppress. The pope in restoring the order, reinstated it in all its laws, rights, and usages. At this hour, under its present general, Beckr, (elected July, 1853) it has an organization as complete as that which it possessed in its most palmy days.

From Gregory XVI and his successor, the present pope, the jesuits have received countenance and favour. The former entrusted to them (2nd Oct., 1836,) the exclusive management of the famous College of the Propaganda, and so in effect had them subdue the world to their sway. As a special token of his esteem, he added to their roll of saints three new names, Gronimo, Pignatelli, and Canisius. Moreover, the beatification of Liguori (27th May, 1839,) was an ovation which the pope had prepared for his be-

loved jesuits. Not less preference has been shown them by Pius IX. In the year 1853 he raised to the rank of demi-gods two of their martyrs, Britto and Bobola. In a Commission which prepared the way for proclaiming the Immaculate Conception two jesuits were included, Perrone and Passaglia, both professors in the jesuit College in Rome.

The efficiency of jesuitism for its own purposes cannot be duly estimated without some particular acquaintance with its constitution, spirit, and aims. The order consists of four graduated classes, at the head of which is one who bears the name of General, under whom are local superiorities. The general is to the order what the pope is to the church—namely, God's Vicar. Holding office for life, he appoints all other office-bearers, and rules the entire body with absolute sway, though in name he is liable to control by the highest of the four classes, convened and met in general assembly. Elected by this body, by the same he may be deposed, but the occasions of deposition are strictly defined and narrowly limited. Should the general, when accused, be found guilty, he is to be induced to resign as of his own accord, that his offence may be kept secret. If his fault is not such as to call for his deposition pains are to be taken to conceal the real object of convening the assembly, and to prevent the notion that the matter handled related to the conduct of the general. One bond unites the members with each other, and with their head. That bond is obedience—blind obedience. In regard to his superior each one is—to use Loyola's own expression—a corpse,—a corpse, that is, as to will—dead in all his powers except his power of action—a tongue which speaks at another's dictation—a hand that executes another's com-

mand. This obedience rests on no mere earthly basis. Divine in its origin, it is of divine authority. This conviction is embedded in the soul of every jesuit. Toward this result tends the whole disciplinary education through which every novice is conducted, expressly with a view to his becoming a member of the order. The result in all its plenitude is rigorously exacted as a condition of admission. In consequence, every brother is simply an instrument in the hands of, first, his immediate superior, and ultimately, of the general in Rome. The language is to be understood without qualification. The word general is very significant. No commander-in-chief on the field of battle has a more thorough control over his force, or is more implicitly obeyed than Peter Beckr. Seated in his chair, in the Roman College, he is at the centre of electric wires which bring to him and convey from him intelligence that connects him with all parts of the world, and makes his word law to thousands of men who have, of their own accord, consented to become his tools, and of tens of thousands of other men more or less influenced by them. We have compared general Beckr's power with that of a Commander-in-chief. No other figure gives any idea of the reality, but even this is poor and tame. A soldier holds but a temporary, sometimes a precarious, command. Those subject to his word are rude, brutish, and self-willed; congregated for the occasion, and bound together by earthly fears and hopes. But the army of the general of the jesuits is composed of men whose training makes them "the finest troops" of their kind in the world, and pledges them irrevocably to their one invariable work, and makes them the passive, yet effective, channels of an equally changeless will—a will, whose nominal aim is "the glory of God," and whose real

aim is, first, the prosperity of a sacerdotal association, and secondly, the supremacy of a sacerdotal sovereign; for God, Jesuitism, the Pope, are the three great aims—aims that are to be sought in common when they concur, but when they conflict, to be sought in the order in which they are here placed; the real and unchanging unity being the prosperity of the Society of Jesus, as the embodiment of certain religious ideas and strivings. These ideas and strivings have for their substance the restoration of the catholicism of the middle ages, involving the supremacy of the church in political no less than in ecclesiastical life. Hildebrand was Loyola's ideal, and is the ideal of his institute. Accordingly, jesuitism is the herald and representation of absolute submission. Trained to passive and implicit obedience themselves, its disciples and advocates labour to bring the whole world into absolute submission, nominally to God, ostensibly to the church, really to the theological and ecclesiastical system of which they are the visible incorporation. The second vow taken by every jesuit binds him to execute whatever the pope commands, and go wherever the pope directs. Often, however, in fact has jesuitism been too strong for the pope. More papal than the papacy, it has now and again disobeyed the papacy for the alleged good of the papacy. Founded specially to counteract the Lutheran Reformation, it is pledged to spare no effort for the extirpation of Protestantism. In times of yore it waged war for that end, and for that end would, if needful, put in practice now the same atrocious means. Their doctrine is (I translate their own words literally), “The Lutherans and all other heretics must, by the punishment of death, be exterminated, slain, driven away, put down, blotted out, cut off by burnings and lashings,

destroyed, blown up, manfully extirpated and slaughtered."* With these objects before them the jesuits have three fields of labour,—1. Home-missions in the Roman Church ; 2. Foreign missions among the heathen ; 3. Missions to other Christians, especially Protestants. Their work is thus seen to be a missionary work from first to last. They were created and are trained expressly for propagandism, and for propagandism over the widest possible surface. Emphatically is their movement reactionary. Their particular design is to withstand Lutherism in all its aims, tendencies, and results, that, having achieved that purpose, they may re-establish the Church of Rome in the proud position she held in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Furnished with all the resources of the most thorough and complete personal culture, duly qualified by ecclesiasticism, the jesuits apply themselves to their herculean task. Hoping to form or reform the ideas of men, they direct their endeavours to the principal sources of thought. They take education into their hands—secular education no less than religious. Next, they make the pulpit their own. A third and a yet more important field is occupied by them, namely, the Confessional. For its exercises they are prepared by a particular systematic course of instruction. In their quality of confessors the jesuits plant themselves in the palace, the mansion, the college. They form and direct the consciences of the washerwoman, the soldier, the diplomatist, the sovereign, not in any case, perhaps, fully, but always as fully as they are able. With unceasing and unresting energy they pursue a course which, so far as successful, brings all men of all ages under their control, and universalizes their own type of character. Holding

* Die Propaganda; part i, p. 71.

confession to be their easiest and most effectual instrument, they labour incessantly for its observance, and have succeeded in reviving and extending the practice in the Roman church. With them, too, we believe, is the source of the zeal for confession which unhappily has broken out in the Church of England. The disciples of Ignatius well know that to restore confession in this land is the readiest way to lead its people back to Rome. If only they can once produce attachment thereto they will, they are confident, soon turn it to their own account. Holding in little estimation the popular Protestantism, they expect to make quick work of Protestant Confessionalism, and build up their own temple out of stones hewn by protestant hands. Indeed every confession heard in the Establishment is a step toward Rome. Our Anglican Confessionalism is a poor, weak, empty thing, and will pass into thin air as soon as dealt with by strong jesuitic realities. Protestantism must cease to play at Romanism, or prepare for being displaced by its rival. Having a special aim and a special work, jesuitism, in addition to the ordinary opinions of Rome, has, also, a special type of doctrine, a right understanding of which is necessary to a full acquaintance with the working of the confessional. Jesuitism designs to revive the mediæval church. Consequently, it revives the scholasticism of Thomas Aquinas, with its sharp outlines and bold outstanding forms. The weapon is the better because it enables jesuitism to take up a position of broad contrast against protestantism, on which it wages an internecine war. The contrast has its root in the respective views taken by the two of the essence of religion. By his doctrine of justification by faith, Luther taught that the essence of religion, humanly considered, is its inwardness; in its ultimate

analysis it is a living union with Christ. With jesuitism religion consists in obedience to commands issued by a legitimate superior, and is consequently outward and independent of the individual. A natural result of the jesuit view is the exaltation of the pope as the source of duty, and, in consequence, the fountain of authority. With jesuitism, accordingly, the pope gives law to the world. Thus man stands no longer face to face with his Creator, and Christ is replaced by the successor of St. Peter. Conscience, in consequence, lies in the hands of Rome. But he who is lord of the conscience is the lord of man. He builds up and he pulls down; he creates and he destroys. Morality depends on his will. The law he promulgates he can dispense with; the penalty he ordains he can remit. Authority emanating from himself may, at his pleasure, be recalled. Kings reign by his permission, and may be deposed at his command. Holding the keys of the kingdom of Christ on earth, he holds, also, the keys of the invisible and eternal world, and can when, where and how he pleases, order or remove purgatorial discipline, bestow endless bliss, and inflict endless woe. The influence of such principles on morality is illustrated in various parts of this volume. Here its immediate connexion with the Confessional may receive a few additional words. Aspiring to engross the power centred therein, jesuitism aimed at popularity in the work, and so took into itself a perverting element. With a view to efficiency it framed morality into a system, arranged and ordered according to recognised principles. It followed that in its hands morality ceased to be natural, simple, clear, impressive. In becoming a science it ceased to be the spontaneous utterance of man's heart, the light of God in man's soul, the power of God in society. Cas-

uistry superseded the Bible. The straight became crooked, the smooth rough, the luminous cloudy or dark. The moment the penitent was taught to take his law not from the divine life of Christ, but the lips of the confessor, morality lost its only true and living root. The consequence of the establishment and recognition of a human authority in morals was the doctrine which decided the character of an action by the intention. If the pope, the jesuit, the confessor—the same under diverse names—is the fountain of moral law, then, so long as you in design are one with either the one or the other, you are morally right. Consequently to act “in (or with) *the intention of the church*” is to perform your duty. It follows that to act contrary is a breach of obligation. If the intention of the church were identical with the will of God, you would be safe under the guidance of these principles. If they differ, and in the degree in which they differ, you are unsafe. But differ they do, and differ greatly. Consequently, your morality is not the morality of Christ. And so jesuitism teaches in the Confessional that you may perform an act forbidden by the law provided your intention is not to sin, but to follow the guidance of the church. Manifest is the moral danger of a doctrine which thus sunders the act from the design, and makes the design depend on the will of the confessor. Every one of the ten commandments may thus be innocently, nay, virtuously broken, by the simple arrangement of acting in the matter according to the presumed or declared intention of an ambitious and self-seeking ecclesiastical establishment. The interests of such an influence, once recognised as paramount, easily override the ordinary principles and rules of morality. Mental reservation, by which what you conceal makes what you say different from

what you mean—another jesuitical principle—receives recognition and passes into practice. But he who changes, and so misleads by suppression, may seek his end by openly declaring this while he secretly intends that, and so reservation begets equivocation; the latter doing by avowal what the former does by silence; and both being criminal because both are employed to deceive, yet both, according to jesuitism, are virtuous and praiseworthy if done “in the intention of the church.” If doing in the intention of the church gives an action its moral character, the road is short and easy which leads to the general position that the end sanctifies the means. A direct avowal of so barefaced an immorality was not to be expected on the part of casuists so distinguished as the jesuits for fine-drawn distinctions and subtle statements. Nevertheless, the doctrine is involved in their declared principles, and finds exemplifications in their ethical manuals as well as in their public and private conduct.

It may be imagined that the ethical pravity of jesuitism is a thing of the past, and that, instructed by its downfalls and the spirit of the age, the society now teaches a morality conformed to the spirit of the New Testament. Such a supposition manifests complete ignorance of Romanism, and especially of jesuitism, its product, shield, and sword. While the ends of the two remain the same their spirit, their means, and their instruments, will undergo no essential change. On this point the historian Gieseler* utters a clear and distinct testimony. “In fact the modern jesuits could do nothing better than to re-establish the society with all its weaknesses and nakedness. Thus there appeared in their books of instruction the old jesuit morality,

* *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, vol. v., p. 42 seq.

with all its immoral doctrines, forming a marked contrast to the ethical tone of the present age."

The principles now expounded, as forming the substance of jesuitism, lead to the exaltation of the papacy as an inevitable consequence. Accordingly, jesuitism has set the pope above all earthly sovereignty, and made him a kind of visible divinity.

The following is

A Summary of Jesuit Teachings respecting the Pope.

- 1.—The pope derives his authority immediately from Christ.
- 2.—The pope is as God to the church.
- 3.—The pope, in virtue of his divine qualifications, teaches the truth, and nothing but the truth, in religious concerns.
- 4.—The pope is the instructor and lord of conscience, and, as such, the source of right and wrong.
- 5.—The pope, as the lord of conscience, exercises supreme power over the outer world, and so is king of kings and lord of lords.
- 6.—The pope, as the lord of conscience, has a right to the obedience of every individual, kings and rulers included, and specially of priests, whom he may at his pleasure exempt from the jurisdiction of the civil power.

These teachings place the whole world at the footstool of the holy see, and at the knees of its representative, the jesuit father, in the Confessional. The teachings now set forth are not merely a revival of the teachings of the darker ages, but a fuller, or rather the fullest, development and enunciation of them, for which the church is indebted to eminent members of the Society of Jesus.

There is another side of this doctrine. The power of the pope could not be really supreme if a rival power were tolerated. Accordingly, while the power of the pope was

derived from God, the power of the sovereign was derived from the people. Lainez, the second general of the order (died 1565), taught this in the Council of Trent in 1562. The thought was taken up and developed by the most considerable teachers of the society. They grounded thereon the right to deprive a non-catholic, or tyrannical prince of his throne; yea, the duty to refuse obedience to such an one, since all were bound to obey God in the pope rather than man in the monarch. A quotation to this effect, taken from the jesuit Mariana, has been already given. The jesuit Pearson applied the doctrine against Queen Elizabeth. Bellarmin has unfolded it in several writings, most comprehensively, in his work on the power of the pope. In Paris it called forth fanatics against Henry III and IV. So speedily did the principles spread that in the religious conflicts of the times they became the common conviction of the orthodox catholic party. The jesuits were their originators. The same society which in our days eulogises itself as the support of thrones and the sole breakwater to the billows of revolution, was, then, the founder of the theory of the sovereignty of the people, and the advocate of revolutions. The contradiction is only in appearance. The self-aggrandisement of the Roman church under the control of the order is the one permanent principle of its policy; all else is changeable, and modifies itself according to the varying conditions of time, place, and person. Even the pope can reckon on its support only so far as his sustentation corresponds to their interests. During the revolutions which characterise the present century the interests of the pope and the jesuits have been molten together by the intense fires which have threatened all the remains of feudalism. The same disturbing forces have identified at

least the apparent interests of thrones and crosiers. The order of Loyola is now, accordingly, found on the side of established sovereignty, not perhaps universal, but in catholic countries. When Louis XVIII returned to the throne of his ancestors, the jesuits, in a time of singular emergency, came forward with other ecclesiastical societies to render him aid, not so much for his sake, however, as for their own. Under the name of *Pères de la foi*, *fathers of the faith*, the disciples of Loyola, favoured by the government, began to circulate through France, preaching the duty of obeying the church, serving the Bourbons, and especially of doing penance. Before all things they strove to bring the people on their knees; their constant cry was "Confession or hell, there is no middle point." They put into requisition all their spiritual arts—visions, miracles, ecclesiastical pomps, fanatical preaching, in order to impress the public mind. They set in action spiritual festivities of a kind so theatrical as to surpass any thing seen before even in France. They treated the French as a people who were fallen away from the faith; which, in consequence, they must win back, and to which they must formally consecrate themselves anew. In their sermons these missionaries described all revolutionary acts as crimes hardly, under any conditions, to be expiated; and represented the alienation of church property, and the putting down of the religious orders, as involving guilt of a yet deeper dye. The newly restored sovereignty of "Saint Louis" they extolled to the skies, regarding his cause and the cause of the church as one. With a view to intense effect, they everywhere closed their mission with a ceremonial solemnity, called "the planting of the cross." A colossal crucifix, decorated with lilies, and so symbolising the

unity of church and state, was borne in a grand procession to an appointed place, where it was dedicated with all possible ecclesiastical parade. Among the performances each one of the faithful fixed on the cross a metal heart bearing his own name. Thus was it symbolically declared that Christ and "Saint Louis" resumed their empire over the rebellious nation. In order to rivet the chain by the bond of sensual devotion, the worship of "The Holy Heart of Jesus" and "The Fraternity of the Holy Heart" were spread as widely as possible. That ceremony was devised by the jesuits in the age of Louis XIV, and recommended by the visions of an hysterical nun. For a time objection was made to the offering of divine worship to a part of the body of Jesus. The jesuits, however, promoted the adoration, and founded brotherhoods for the express purpose. During the abolition of their own order they made the fraternity their rallying point and their bond of union. It was especially in the south and west of France that these missionaries found admission. There they spread the most mischievous fanaticism. The diabolical spirit, showing itself in various methods, occasioned a bitter persecution against the Protestants. A general cry arose, "One king, one faith!" which was the signal for the outbursting of the popular rage. In Nismes, Toulouse, Avignon, Montepellier, &c., the protestants were calumniated, plundered, and worried to death. Their extermination was publicly proposed and defended. The days of Louis XIV seemed about to return. The calamity was prevented solely by the strength of political liberalism. Michelet and Quinet kept in effectual check the jesuits Ravignan and Cahour. In consequence, the order, though encouraged, was not recalled. Nevertheless, the cruelly injured protestants failed to obtain repara-

tion. Since then the progress of jesuitism, and therewith of the Confessional, in France has been almost one unbroken success. The ancient liberties of the Gallic church have been thrown into the shade, and their maintenance made disreputable as a heresy. Ultramontanism is become triumphant. It aided Louis Napoleon to seize the reins of power. It is, next to the army, his strongest buttress. France has two passions, a military passion and a religious (or superstitious) passion. The present emperor reigns by pandering to both. Aiming to found a dynasty, he is prompt to employ the requisite means, that is, the army and the church. The thirst for military glory he has gratified in the Italian campaign. At the peace of Villafranca he paid homage to ecclesiastical ambition. His uncle compelled the reigning pope to place on his head the consecrated and consecrating crown. The same result is sought after by the nephew through mock deference and political cajolery. These vile means seem to be carried very far. What if it shall turn out that at the famous breakfast partaken by Louis Napoleon and Francis Joseph a catholic league against protestantism, dictated by the jesuits, was and is the underlying thought and recognised basis, being the price paid by the French despot for the support of the dominant powers in the papal church? What has been achieved in France is attempted in every protestant country, but nowhere with so much zeal and determination as in Great Britain.

The history of jesuitism in Great Britain is, except to the initiated, obscure because inaccessible. Jesuitism in protestant lands works in secrecy, giving no information itself, and refusing information to enquirers. Progress and power are its aims; publicity it employs and permits only

so far as it may conduce to those purposes. And in England and Ireland it has been judged better to operate noiselessly and in the shade. In consequence, materials for a sketch of jesuitism in this country are difficult to be found, except in works written for catholic readers and for catholic objects. Such a work is the “*Histoire Religieuse, Politique, et Litteraire de la Compagnie de Jesus, composée par J. Cretineau-Joly*” (Paris, 1844), from which mainly the following outline is taken (Tome 6, 79, seq.) The last of the Tudors and the first of the Stuarts were personal enemies of the Society of Jesus. Charles I neither protected his friends (the jesuits) nor combatted his enemies (their assailants), nor defended himself: he had all the weaknesses and all the misfortunes of kings without a will. The revolution of 1688 was effected under the cry of *Death to the Jesuits!* When this revolution had thrown its first anger to the winds, the jesuits found themselves more peaceable than ever under the new dynasty. English Catholics, having learnt endurance at the lips of the jesuits, gladly gave them an asylum. In the beginning of the 18th century religious liberty afforded the disciples of Loyola less restricted scope; by which, however, they were not slow to profit. Careful to avoid the penalties of the law, they declared themselves attached to the holy see in the bottom of their souls, and began to acquire fixed places of abode, in which, at first in secrecy, then by little and little openly, they dwelt united in society. Such in their origin were the missions of Liverpool, Bristol, Preston, Norwich, and many other cities. A small chapel was annexed to the house where they conducted their worship. They survived the decree by which pope Clement XIV suppressed the order. They survived, also, efforts made against them by

the highest catholic authorities in these islands. Yet they were in straits here and in foreign lands; when an opulent Englishman, Thomas Weld, gave them a home in his estate and mansion at Stoneyhurst, in Lancashire. Here numbers settled, affording a refuge to their brethren abroad as well as at home, and founding educational institutions for laymen and clerks, which have proved a most effectual nursery of their principles, and a main focus of their power. In the midst of the noises and confusion of the wars carried on by England against Napoleon I, the Stoneyhurst retreat escaped public notice and the notice of the government, and every year grew more efficient for its objects. Receiving under its roof many eminent men, and being specially honoured by having the son of its benefactor enrolled among its members, the Lancashire college operated powerfully on its environs, sent out missionaries to various parts of the country, and gradually affecting public opinion, prepared, with other aid, the way for the great political change effected in the position of catholicism by the Amancipation Act of 1829. That measure, however, was accompanied by precautionary restrictions, aimed specially at the disciples of Saint Ignatius, for it forbad all subjects of the crown to take any religious vow in England, or to return and dwell here after having taken any religious vow in a foreign land, requiring every member of a religious society to be registered before a magistrate on his coming into this realm. Exile was the penalty of disobedience. The members of the Society of Jesus *quietly disregarded these restrictive measures*, and were covered by the popular feeling in favour of complete toleration. They accordingly silently held and strengthened their position. This they did so effectually that from 1826 to 1835 eleven

churches were erected by their efforts. "Then, also, began that movement toward catholicism which, impressed on the learned and noble classes, progresses with so much rapidity, that it is impossible to calculate its results. In view of the catholic idea, which has lost nothing of its primitive sap, Great Britain is neither alarmed nor moved. It sees the jesuits found colleges and build churches even in the capital of the three kingdoms; it measures the degree of fervour which welcomes Puseyism; it hears the most honoured heads of its universities proclaim their Anglican doubts, and publish their new belief under the ægis of the holy see, the sole immovable authority on earth. As the British Government has laid down the premises of the principle of liberty, it adopts all its consequences. The jesuits are English citizens. In this character, which they take with pride, they are permitted to teach the young, to spread their faith, and to guide others."

"Ireland was never placed in a condition equally favourable with catholic England. The jesuits attached themselves to its destinies amid the persecutions of which it was the object. In the earliest days after its foundation, the Order of Jesus gave to Ireland apostles and comforters, nor has it ever ceased to supply similar benefactions. In the commencement of this century, the jesuits resolved to achieve a renovation, within and without, in Irish catholicism. Severe labours and great sacrifices were required. The object was attained. In 1840, at the moment when, by retreats and missions, they taught the multitudes to celebrate the third centenary of the foundation of their order, it was by popularising the work of another that they obtained the most striking success. The Capuchin,

Theobald Matthew, had, two years before, laid the foundation of the Temperance Society. *The jesuits seized whatever advantage* that voluntary renunciation of intoxicating drinks could furnish in a country like Ireland. They made themselves the most zealous propagators of the Christian thought of the Rev. Mr. Matthew ; which, by their efforts, extended with inconceivable rapidity. The Temperance Society was the auxiliary of the missions which the jesuit Fathers undertook, but never did it turn them aside from their own particular object.

“ In 1829, their number increased with their ascendancy ; they were the right arm of the bishops. Then the general of the company judged it opportune to detach Ireland from the province of England. In 1841, a college was established in Dublin under the auspices of Saint Francois Xavier, and England manifested no alarm at this augmentation of catholic influence. Anglicanism was shaken by the return toward unity of a great number of upright minds in the Three Kingdoms, who, under the aid of study, succeeded in demonstrating the void in their official beliefs. A slow but happy change disclosed itself in the midst of British society. Every one felt that the jesuits took the better part therein.”

This change, we may add, has been proceeding under the same auspices in both England and Ireland, down to the present hour. The Synod of Thurles, and the Romanist division of England into ecclesiastical departments, are among its more obvious and decided results. The less obvious, but more-to-be-feared, results, are the silent conversions which are proceeding among the large manufacturing populations, and the gradual extension throughout Great Britain of the numbers and the influence of the

Romanist communion. Of the extent of these changes little is or can be known, beyond the limits of that aggressive and stealthy church. But its character is declared in its original. Proceeding in the main from jesuitism it is essentially jesuitical. Indeed, English catholicism has of late years suffered a radical change, and a change greatly for the worse. The imminence of danger in which Romanism has stood, and stands, has complicated the catholic position in England; and, making it unnatural, has subjected it to the influence of the strongest, more ambitious and more extreme of its partisans. These, as a matter of fact, are the jesuits. Under their ceaseless endeavours and ever-growing ascendancy, the qualified Romanism of English catholics has been gradually imbued with the ultramontane spirit; the healthy state of mind formerly prevalent, which made them more British than Romanist, has been superseded by papal and foreign attachments, the tendency and silent aim of which, is the aggrandisement of their religion in its more than papal pretensions—in other words, the success and eventual triumph of jesuitism. This impression many of them may have been unwilling to take, but they are not strong enough to withstand the overbearing influence of jesuit sacerdotalism. What we hope is, that that enervating and despotic order of priests will make their yoke too heavy and too galling for English necks. When it is so, it will inevitably be thrown off, and British catholicism may become less formidable by becoming more purely Christian. Meanwhile, the utmost vigilance, and even counteracting zeal, is the duty of British Protestants.

The avowed force of Rome in England, during the year

1858, is shown by this statement:—

			Chapels.			Priests.			Total.
1780	190	359	549
1858	749	1036	1785*

In the interval between the two dates the population of England has more than doubled, while the numbers just given have more than trebled, exhibiting an increase achieved by Rome, in a ratio greater than that of the increase of the population. Whether any, or, if any, how many, of these priests belong to the Order of Jesus, the Catholic Directory for 1859 does not state. From the statistical notices issued by the Propaganda, we learn, however, that not only Dominican, San Franciscan, and Augustinian monks, but jesuits also, conduct missions in this country. From the same authority, we learn that in 1843 the Jesuits had in England 17 missions, residences and colleges, with 67 fathers, 46 scholars, and 16 brother coadjutors.† The number of Jesuits, with their establishments, has doubtless increased much since that date. That there is a large and flourishing Jesuit college at Stonyhurst, in Lancashire, has been already intimated. There are probably others in England. Certainly “the Catholic Directory,” issued by authority, reports, as existing here, “ten colleges,” “thirty-four religious houses and communities of men,” and “one hundred and ten convents,” not to mention a considerable number of schools, both of the higher and lower class. This, it must be allowed, is a considerable force. In zeal and activity it is more considerable than in numbers, and, when we call to mind the gross ignorance and easy credulity of those on whom it works in the lower ranks, it will appear to present formidable aspects. In England, indeed, the

* The “Catholic Directory” for 1859.

† Die Propaganda, II., 62.

soil is not so favourable as on the Continent. "Lying wonders" here are, therefore, few and far between. Yet no small success is achieved. The Confessional is kept busy, Ever and anon a convert is brought in. At any rate, zeal is kindled, sustained, augmented, among actual Romanists, and preparations are made for a more productive propaganda. The endeavours proceed in a variety of manners. The most popular concentrate themselves in missions. In the large manufacturing populations missions are common. The opening, conducting and closing of a mission are occasions replete with excitement. Besides the dumb-show of the altar, preachings are frequent, and very frequent, are confessions. The Marian idolatry is specially fostered. Not long since, a scene of the kind was enacted in the church of St. Alban's, Macclesfield, when "the resurrection of the Virgin Mary" was bodied forth visibly.

During the mission, of which this piece of acting formed a part, narratives were told which would disgrace a mountebank. On one occasion, the preacher, urging the duty of attending mass and of abstaining from Protestant churches and schools, related a story of some boys who went to take a walk in the fields. Suddenly they saw a black cloud over their heads. Out of the cloud came a voice. The voice said, "Strike him dead." Immediately one of the boys fell down a corpse. A second command followed, and a second corpse. Again the voice spake, but this time to spare, saying, "Don't strike *him* dead, for he has been to mass this morning." Could any one have obtained a hearing from the auditors, they might have been undeceived by the question, "What was the verdict of the coroner's inquest?"*

* Romish Legends, with remarks by the Rev. C. O'N. Pratt, curate of Christ Church, Macclesfield.

From jesuitism in low life we pass to jesuitism in high life, thinking it of importance to exhibit, before we close, the two monster evils of Romanism, jesuitism and the Confessional, as operating in one person and for the same ends.

We select for the purpose Père la Chaise, intending to speak of his influence on Louis XIV. We will abstain, as much as possible, from using words of our own, and select, as the sources of our statements, two eminent authorities. The first is the Historical Dictionary of Bouillet, a work which, in 1847, was authorised by the Royal Council of Public Instruction in France, and which, in 1852, had the additional recommendation of being put into the Roman Index of prohibited books. The second is a review of the life of Père la Chaise, by a warm apologist, De Chantelauze, a catholic of distinction, whose work has just (1859) appeared, drawn up from private letters and official documents. From the former source we translate what follows:—
 “Francois d'Aix, called Father la Chaise, a Jesuit, born in 1624, died in 1709, for a long while taught philosophy at Lyons, and became the provincial general of his order. In 1675 he was chosen by Louis XIV. for his confessor, and occupied the post until his death, that is, for a period of four-and-thirty years. He took part in all the intrigues of the Court. Placed between Madame de Montespan (the king's mistress) and Madame de Maintenon (her rival); he took part with the latter, and promoted her (secret) marriage with Louis XIV. In the religious quarrels of the day he had his share: in the revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685), in the discussions concerning Quietism, and in the condemnation of Fenelon, as well as in the persecutions exercised against the Jansenists, and was on all

occasions devoted to the interests of his order. In character he was supple, dexterous and insinuating. He knew how to alarm or tranquilise the conscience of the king, according to the necessity of the occasion. He is said to have been mild and obliging. He left behind him some writings. A course of philosophy in Latin may be mentioned. He was a member of l'Académie des Inscriptions. Louis XIV. built for his confessor, on the east of Paris, a fine country house, called Mont-Louis. The enclosure by which it was surrounded has since been converted into a cemetery, which still bears the name of Père la Chaise."

From the second work we shall give several extracts illustrative of the views this jesuit director of the royal conscience entertained, and the part which he played. The debaucheries of Louis XIV, as well as his despotism, are well known. When his power of sinning was all but gone, he renounced his sins, and contracted a secret marriage with a rival of his last mistress. That rival was Madame de Maintenon. However, he persecuted his protestant subjects, and that merit atoned for his crimes. Had his spiritual advisers—Bossuet, Père la Chaise, and others—chosen, they might have compelled him, on pain of excommunication, to renounce his sensualities. They preferred selling their indulgence at the price of liberal patronage toward objects they held dear. Father la Chaise purchased the persecution of his protestant fellow subjects by the exercise of his Confessional prerogatives in such a way as to make the king at ease in his conscience. Evidences of these facts abound in the pages of our authority. Madame de Maintenon testifies to the Confessor's want of courage. "All these projects are useless. No one but le Père la Chaise can succeed. Twenty times has he deplored with

me the misdeeds of the king, but why has he not absolutely refused him the sacraments? The Confessor is satisfied with half a conversion. He is an honourable man, but the air of the Court spoils the purest virtue and unnerves the severest." (p. 15.) It is desirable to know how the worthy jesuit and others wrote about the sensual monarch. In a letter addressed to the General of his Order (Oliva), the Confessor uses these words:—"I have seen in your letter the sentiments of tenderness and gratitude which the sovereign pontiff signifies toward the king, with so much the greater joy because no one knows better than myself to what point his majesty deserves them, not only by the admirable things he is doing for religion, which much surpasses all that can be reported to you, but by the pure and sincere zeal for the true faith and the salvation of souls with which he does them, preferring to all his own interests those of God and of Christianity." (p. 47). To a fellow jesuit, by name Verbiest, he describes Louis XIV in these terms:—"All the holy and zealous persons of this very flourishing kingdom, where Louis the Great diligently establishes the unity of the catholic faith and virtue and piety, by his own example, as well as by his cares, his edicts and his continual liberalities* - - - "our great king, whom God has given to Europe as the defender and restorer of the true faith." (p. 58). Long had the king exerted his influence against his protestant subjects, but when la Chaise assumed the direction of his conscience, "the home missions (against heresy) underwent considerable augmentation. In 1679 Madame de Maintenon wrote,

* Our author gives in a note this explanation:—"This is an allusion to the considerable sums expended by Louis XIV for the conversion of the Protestants."

“The king reflects seriously on the conversion of the heretics, and in a little while will set to at it in good earnest.” Chantelauze continues—“Soon conversion became the ruling passion—the principal occupation of the court and the city.” Le Père la Chaise was charged by Louis XIV with the supreme direction of the missions sent into the provinces infected with heresy. Among the preachers the jesuits signalized themselves before all others. To encourage the work, his majesty furnished all necessary aid and money. The pope and the clergy greatly approved those acts of liberality. The protestants, however, declared they were ‘resolved to obey God rather than men.’ The fact was placed under the eyes of the monarch, and he was induced to support the missions by troops. The dragonades ensued. The king was deceived as to the number of the converts. He believed it was all over with protestantism. The Edict of Nantes was considered a dead letter. Its revocation easily ensued. Madame de Maintenon, two years before the revocation, (in 1685) wrote, “We are very well satisfied with le Père de la Chaise. He inspires the king with great undertakings. Soon will his subjects serve God in spirit and in truth.” In another letter, written a year later, she says “The king intends to labour for the conversion of the heretics. He is ready to do whatever shall be judged useful for the welfare of religion. This undertaking will cover him with glory before God and before men. He will have caused his subjects to return into the bosom of the church, and he will have destroyed the heresy which his predecessors have been unable to subdue.” (p. 174, seq.)

While La Chaise laboured to extirpate the Protestants, he laboured also for the aggrandisement of the jesuits, to

whom he belonged. The latter, indeed, was only a means for the execution of the former. "The jesuits," says Chantelauze, "owed to his unwearying zeal and his high influence with the king, the formation of new establishments and the development of those they already possessed" (p. 73). The reason of the zeal employed on behalf of the Jesuits, appears in these words, used by him in letters to Oliva: "What I have done up to now for our colleges and our houses is a small matter. Our society is my mother, my family, my all. I belong to it entirely, and I will always employ on its behalf all my power, whether of influence or activity" (p. 80.) Nor were his importunities with Louis unproductive; "that excellent prince has commanded me in his name to assure you, in the most decided manner, that he will always have at heart the interests of our society, in recompense of the continual services rendered by it to the Christian world, and that we shall never appeal in vain to his will and his authority, to defend and protect it" (p. 81).

Chantelauze undertakes to justify the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and generally the persecution of the Protestants. We shall transcribe his words, omitting every mere accessory. "In Europe, in the seventeenth century, there existed between the national religion and the temporal authority, a union so intimate, that they were considered indivisible, and that revolt against religion was accounted the same as crimes against the state. 'Whoever,' said the code of Justinian, 'violates the established religion sins against public order.' To attack religion was to attack the civil power. This maxim held its ground in the days of Louis XIV. Bossuet himself said, 'It is by the mutual concert of the priesthood and of the empire that the catholic religion has preserved the precious deposit of the faith.'

Thence ensued the obligation for catholic monarchs to maintain, even by force, the integrity of the faith. The same illustrious bishop declared ‘the exercise of the power of the sword, in matters of religion and conscience, cannot be called in question without enervating, and, as it were, paralysing the public authority. The right is certain, but moderation is not less necessary.’ This doctrine was generally admitted by the church. It had on its behalf eminent saints, such as Saint Augustin and Saint Bernard. It applied, however, only to heretics. In revoking the Edict of Nantes, then, Louis XIV. did but conform to the common right generally recognised and practised by his contemporaries. ‘Toleration,’ as a recent author has said, ‘was like heresy, a novelty in France.’ Liberty of conscience was considered the greatest evil that could afflict society. Nothing, therefore, is more evident than the right which Louis XIV. had to revoke the edict of Nantes. To restore to the true religion its splendour, to place the tranquillity of the state on sure grounds, to strengthen the rights of authority, which had been compelled to make compromises with armed rebellion,—such are the three great considerations which show that the revocation was a salutary measure. Religion, no less than the monarchy, was interested in recovering the position it had lost. For many years the clergy had demanded that the privileges granted to the protestants should be suppressed, their places of worship demolished, and the work of conversion more fully developed. The assembly of 1680 expressed a desire to see heresy die at the feet of the king. Nor did the king’s policy neglect any thing fitted to enfeeble protestantism. His participation in religious affairs might surprise us did we not remember that our kings had a sacer-

dotal character, and as such were considered as exterior bishops and the right arm of the church. The right of intervention was not only one of their prerogatives, but, also, one of the most obligatory of their duties. Fenelon himself, though he believed in liberty of conscience, did not allow the public exercise of a religion different from that of the state. He says, 'If a sovereign could exact the interior belief of his subjects in religion, he could prevent the public exercise or the profession of opinions or ceremonies which might trouble the peace of the republic by the diversity and multiplicity of sects; but his authority does not go farther.' Louis XIV was only the interpreter of the wishes of all catholics. As soon as the Edict was published it called forth a burst of universal joy in all catholic countries. The pope, in a consistory which he held expressly to announce to the cardinals the revocation of the edict, lauded the act in a Latin oration, in emphatic terms. Nor was that all; a *Te Deum* was sung in Rome in all the churches, during which they ceased not to fire cannon from the castle, and for two consecutive days, the pope ordered in Rome bonfires and illuminations." (p. 170 seq.) Not content with these marks of signal satisfaction, the pope wrote a letter to Louis, which we translate, the rather because it is little known.

Letter of Pope Innocent XI to Louis XIV, thanking the king for the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

Our very dear son in Jesus Christ,

Among all the distinguished proofs which your majesty has given of your natural piety, none is more striking than the truly worthy zeal of the very Christian King, as you are, which has induced you to revoke all the ordinances issued in favour of the heretics of your kingdom, and to

take steps, as you have done, by very wise edicts, for the propagation of the orthodox faith, as we have learnt from our very dear son, the duke d'Estrees, your ambassador in our court. We have judged it to be a duty to write you this letter, to give an authentic and durable testimony of the enlogies we bestow on the fine religious sentiments your mind displays, and to congratulate you on the load of immortal praises which, by this last act, you have added to all those which render your life so glorious. The catholic church will not forget to mark in her annals so great a proof of your devotion towards her, and will never cease to extol your name. Above all, you may expect from the Divine Bounty the reward of so noble a deed, and be persuaded that we shall continually put up to the same Goodness very ardent prayers with a view to that result. Our venerable brother, the archbishop of Fano, will say to you the rest, and from our heart we give your majesty our apostolical benediction.

Rome, 13th Nov., 1685.

The evils inflicted in France by this act were great, numerous and lasting. I can find room merely for a few words touching the number of the Protestant sufferers. "Voltaire says that in the space of three years, near 50,000 families quitted the kingdom, and were followed by as many others. A Protestant minister, Antoine Court, raises the number to 100,000 persons. Sismondi, adhering to the less considerable numbers, thinks that there remained in France more than 1,000,000 of Protestants, and that from 300,000 to 400,000 went into exile. It appears to us probable, that from 400,000 to 500,000 persons were thus lost to France, and these generally belonged to the most enlightened, the most industrious and the most moral of

the nation. It is equally difficult to calculate the number of the Protestants who perished in attempts at emigration, partial combats, prisons, the galleys, the scaffolds. Sismondi thinks that there perished as many as emigrated. The number seems to us excessive. However, Boulainvillers asserts that, under the rule of Lamaignon de Bâville, in the single province of Languedoc, 100,000 persons were victims to premature death, and that the tenth of them perished by burning, hanging and the rack. We ought, perhaps, to add 100,000 others for the remainder of the kingdom in the 18th century. 200,000 Frenchmen sacrificed after an edict which had been in existence nearly ninety years! These are the sad and sanguinary hecatombs immolated on the altars of intolerance."*

CHAPTER VI.

FINAL JUDGMENT; THE CONFSSIONAL IRREFORMABLE.

Our space is exhausted—our space, not our subject, nor our materials. Abundant is what remains of both. We keep them back with the less hesitation because they would hardly do more than add illustrations to what is, alas! but too clear, namely, that the Confessional, as the principal arm of the papacy, is deadly to the great interests of man, whether considered as an individual or a member of society, as a mortal or an immortal being. So huge, so

* *Histoire des Protestants de France par J. de Felice. Paris, 1850. P. 417.*

formidable, so imminent and pressing is the evil, that it demands the utmost efforts for counteraction. Step by step, and inch by inch, must the aggressions of popery be withstood. Not merely our religion, but our civil liberty and our social prosperity, are at stake ; nay, even the security and peace of our homes. Were Romanism merely an ecclesiastical organisation, its endeavours and even its successes might be regarded with comparatively small concern ; *but it is a political power* ; politics are an element essential to its nature, and inseparable from its existence. The pope is a temporal prince, as well as a religious potentate. Sovereign, *de facto*, of Italian lands, he is, *de jure*, sovereign of all the lands of the earth, since as being the lord of the mind, he is the lord of material interests, and having supreme power over faith and morals, has supreme power over education, criminal justice, and administrative authority of every kind, from the policeman and the executioner, to the judge and the monarch. This theoretical view is constantly and diligently put forth and maintained in the practice of ordinary life so far (to the utmost) as the condition of the world or the condition of separate nations may allow. Hence, the pope is not only the enemy of constitutional or representative government, but the rival of princes. Not less than in the middle ages is the power of the church an assailant of the power of the state, and if in any country at the present hour the pope is in alliance with the crown, it is only with despotic crowns ; with which the alliance is the closer the more they are despotic ; and the alliance is made, not for the love of the crown, still less for its aggrandisement, but as a less evil than the ascendancy of the people or the predominance of civil liberty ; against both of which the pope and all his emis-

saries ever wage an unappeasable and deadly war. These political pretensions and this political power of the papacy make the pope the great disturber of the peace of the world. While he remains a temporal prince Rome can be nothing but a huge powder magazine, whose explosion, ever imminent, threatens the safety of Italy, and involves the convulsion of Europe. From that danger England is by no means free. Witness the agitations and demands of the jesuits and priests of Ireland at the present moment. By firm resistance only can the peril be warded off. NO MORE CONCESSIONS TO THE POPE must be our protestant rallying cry. What he has let him keep. We are glad that his hands are untied, for now we are not ashamed to strike him, and strike him with the sword of the spirit we will manfully and ceaselessly, as at present the enemy of the human race and the very embodiment of the spirit of Antichrist.

A great advantage accrues from the present political complications in connection with the pretensions of the papacy. A revival of the worst spirit of bye-gone ages is proceeding before our eyes. No longer is it possible for men to delude themselves with the notion that the papacy has undergone a change for the better. The notion is contradicted by facts too patent to require enumeration. More important is it that the hopes excited by partial and temporary successes have tempted Romanists to declare explicitly that their system is equally unchanged and unchangeable. Of these numerous declarations the following suffice :

Sint ut sunt aut non sint.

Decreta dogmatica concilii oecumenica, confirmata a Romano Pontifice, *irreformabilia* sunt ex se seu ante consensum et acceptionem ecclesiae.*

* Perrone, II., 996, 1020.

Romanus Pontifex ex cathedra definiens in rebus fidei et morum *infallibilis* est, ejusque dogmatica decreta, etiam antequam accedat ecclesiae consensus, sunt prorsus *irreformabilia*.

“Let them be as they are, or let them not be.” These proud words are the answer given to only too legitimate demands made for reforms in Jesuitism. On the principle of that answer Jesuitism has been governed and administered from the first to this hour. The principle of that answer is the principle of the Roman see. An infallible power is, of course, irreformable; for, how can that which is infallible be improved, when, in its nature, it never can nor does go wrong, err or fail. This infallible and irreformable authority has its centre and its representative in the pope for the time being. At this moment it resides in *Pio Nono*. Here, then, we find in perfection the once exclusively royal prerogative of the divine right to govern wrong. And here, too, is the ground of that resistance to all political reforms which, at this hour, makes Italy the threatening volcano of European society. Why, what would the innovators have? Have they not infallibility in the ecclesiastical domination of the papal states? Change to lay agency is simply change for the worse, for it is a declension from what is perfect. They talk of foreign bayonets as upholding the papal throne; they talk of the combination against ecclesiastical despotism of all the virtue, learning, purity, wealth, and rank of the land; they talk of the calm, earnest and determined demands of the whole people, for the suppression of Jesuitism, the extirpation of monkery, the secularisation of government, and the recognition of constitutional rights, in order that the prisons may be emptied of the noble patriots who are rotting

therein, and the streets be swept of the swarms of filthy beggars by whom they are covered, and the suburban districts be cleared of the murdering bandits by whom they are infested ; and the whole nation, now in tears and with dishevelled hair, may lift her fair and lovely head, and smile once more, surrounded by the symbols of freedom, peace and plenty. Reformers talk of these things, and talk of them as though they were the sovereign good of life. Well is it that their governors are wiser than they. Well is it that they are blessed with a paternal government which is, happily, at once infallible and irreformable. True, its will is not executed without pains and penalties—such is the wicked perversity of the human heart !—but if the body is incarcerated, starved, smitten with death—what then ? the soul is saved, and saved with the fulness of blessing which comes from an infallible priesthood. The infallibility, as well as the irreformableness, of that priesthood, is expressly declared in the second and third citations given above. We have given them in the original Latin, to guard ourselves against suspicion. We now place them before the reader in plain English.

“The dogmatic decrees of an œcumenical council, confirmed by the Roman pontiff, are *irreformable* of their own nature, that is, independently of the consent and acceptance of the church.”

“The Roman pontiff, laying down any position in virtue of his authority in matters of faith and morals is *infallible*, and his dogmatic decrees, even without the consent of the church, are altogether *irreformable*.”

Thus, then, it appears that the pope, for the time being, is not only the lord of conscience in the church, but the source and the law of right and wrong to the

world. This doctrine is somewhat comprehensive ;—but only they can duly appreciate its comprehensiveness who are acquainted with the huge musty tomes that contain the heterogeneous determinations of councils, bulls and the canon law—which, taken as a whole, presents one tremendous and all but incredible contradiction to the spirit, aims and tendencies of the present age. Peace? there can be no peace while these two primal and gigantic powers clash together and contend for the dominion of the world. The warfare waxes fiercer every day. Of its fierceness at this instant, English protestants in general have no idea. The author, having access to Continental literature, passes no week without meeting with additional proofs and illustrations of the ruthless determination of the extreme Jesuitical party, which now governs the Roman court and sways the resources of the papacy, to push their advantage at every risk, and win supremacy by one bold and decisive stroke. The hand prepared to deal the blow draws every moment nearer and nearer to the heart of England, hated by Rome with bitterest enmity. Romanist Continental authorities are unable to conceal the joy with which they contemplate a papal crusade against this, the principal bulwark of Protestantism. Should the storm, which some descry as gathering on the verge of the horizon, burst on our shores, its spirit will be ecclesiastical, its purpose papal, its end the harnessing of the English churches, crushed into one dead body, to the triumphal car of Rome. Woe! woe the day! But there is a God above who loves truth—the author of the Gospel, the Father of Jesus Christ, and who now, as always, is making even the wrath of man to serve his purposes and promote his sovereign will.

I have referred to exhibitions of the true spirit of the

papacy with which I am almost daily becoming aware. With one of these, though less unknown in England than most others, I bring this work to a close.

Immediately after the signature of the peace of Villafranca, one of the most justly esteemed patriots of Italy, the Marquis d'Azeglio, addressed to the inhabitants of the Romagna a proclamation, in which, among other great truths, he declared that "God created man free to think, alike in things religious and things political." The pope seems to have regarded such a statement as a challenge, and, accordingly, hastened to put forth an authoritative contradiction. In this document, which bears the shape of a letter addressed to the bishop of Albano, Vicar-Cardinal of Rome, he emphatically condemns "those who proclaim that God created man free to think alike in things religious and things political, for that they thus disown the authorities established by God on the earth, to whom obedience and respect are due, and at the same time forget the immortality of the soul, which, when it shall have passed from the transitory to the eternal, will have to give a special account of its religious opinions to the inexorable Judge, learning then, but too late, that there is only one God and one faith, and that whosoever quits the ark of unity will be submerged in the deluge of eternal punishment." This declaration is but the reiteration of a doctrine which is now the recognised faith of Romanism. The extent of the pretension can be seen only when it is distinctly observed that even the supreme pontiff denies that man is free in political thought any more than in religious, and that in the former, as well as in the latter, the world owes obedience and respect to the occupant of St. Peter's chair. This granted, then the politics of the Roman

court are, or ought to be, the politics of every court. Consequently, Queen Victoria, in civil as well as religious matters, is bound to conform to the decrees of Pius IX, on pain of eternal punishment. What is this but an open revival of the extremest pretensions of the papacy? Thus is Rome daily unveiling herself, and showing her real features more and more. Urged on to claim every thing, and so to dare every thing by her jesuitical advisers, she is digging more wide and more deep that gulph between the civilization of the age and herself, in which ere long she must be precipitated to sink and perish, as a god on earth, without redemption and without pity. Her political power must be annihilated. But her political power is only a corollary to her religious power. Accordingly, both the sacerdotal and the secular supremacy of the pope must be destroyed by the spirit of the age, which, in its main features, we hold to be the spirit of God in the Gospel of his Son.

ROMA DELENDA.



APPENDIX I.

A NEW AND BASE TRAFFIC IN SACRED THINGS.

In more than one part of the volume I have made reference to the matter of intentions as acknowledged and observed in the papal church. Thus, in the baptism of infants, all that is required on the part of the minister, whether lay or ecclesiastical, is that "he intends to do what the church does." This doctrine is carried so far that if the agent observes the entire rite as presented by Rome, yet in his mind says to himself, "I do not intend what the church does," in that case the baptism is of no value, or, rather, is no baptism at all. A few additional words will bring into prominence a refinement of papal corruption which is "too bad."

It is a doctrine of Romanism, that what is called "a pious intention" in connexion with a mass has a positive and intrinsic value and efficacy before God. A pious intention is an intention or wish in conformity with the mind of the church, the bishop, or the pope. Thus, A. pays the priest to say a mass wishing that the pope's will (whatever it may be) may be fulfilled by God—say in the conversion of England to Romanism; or wishing that his wife may be safely delivered, or that a deceased friend may be set free from purgatory. The "intentions" thus entertained, being gifted with merit by the mass, are so many spiritual values or forces applicable by suffrage or transference to others. The money is paid to the priest, who sometimes fills his purse by increasing the traffic in working on the superstition of the worshippers, and yet either does not say the mass at all, or postpones the ceremony. Of such masses, however, as he is hired to say in the general intention of the church he holds the merits in his own hands, and over their application has supreme control. Here, then, he possesses a spiritual capital or stock-in-trade—not money, but money's worth. These intentions he can sell, and does sell. There ensues a regularly organised traffic in these merits or spiritual powers. For example—

II.

B. has a son at sea and fears that his life is in danger. Prompted by his fatherly concern, he wishes to purchase (according to his means) five, ten, twenty "pious intentions." An office exists where he can make the purchase. He repairs thither, and buys what he wants. He is now consoled in the thought that so much "intention" as he has purchased will go to guard and preserve his son. How are the goods got together in the office? The office is kept by C., a priest, perhaps a priest of some note. C. advertises that he is publishing a series of desirable books. In his great Christian charity, particularly remembering that priests are not rich in this world's gear, he offers his books each at so many "intentions." Another priest, D, has intentions at his disposal. Of these he puts the requisite number into the hands of C., and receives in return the volume. These intentions C. sells to whosoever may buy them, and so pays his authors, printers, paper makers, &c., and employs the surplus as he pleases. This species of traffic, which is of long standing, has lately been exposed in the *Journal des Debats*.

APPENDIX II.

THE INQUISITION AT THE PRESENT HOUR.

It may not be known that the Inquisition still exists. Nevertheless it is one of the actual blessings which the subjects of the pope owe to their ecclesiastico-political master. In the recently emancipated Romagna the horrible tribunal has just been abolished, but in Rome itself it prolongs its hateful existence. Nay, "The tribunal of the Sacred Office," as it is called, holds its murderous and guilty head high above all other tribunals, and pronounces decisions against which there is no appeal. Exercising jurisdiction over what it terms "crimes of conscience," it possesses an elasticity which expands and recedes at the will of superstition. Rising to the terrible energy of burning a human being for the bold crime of heresy, it descends to the petty crimes of eating flesh meat on Friday, and carrying a parcel on Sunday. To this moment a jew is not allowed to travel without a license duly "signed, sealed, and delivered" by

the officials of "the Holy Inquisition." We present a copy of one of these printed licenses, the rather because it is not only an ecclesiastical curiosity, but, in the words printed in Italics, strikingly and painfully exemplifies papal morality.

"BY THESE PRESENTS permission is granted to *the Jew A.B.*, nation of to absent himself from *Ghetto* for the space of under the express condition that his conduct is exempt from any misdeed against our holy religion and sound morals, during his absence; that on his return he, on the earliest day, restore this license to the Sacred Tribunal, and that he never quit the place hereafter without a fresh permission in writing; declaring at the same time, that the said permission is of no value if the bearer, on arriving at the place of his destination, does not forthwith present it to the bishop, to the inquisitor, or to their *locum-tenens*, by whom it must be *viséd*. *Moreover, this permission will be no value if those authorities, from just motives, think they ought not to take it into consideration, or ought to limit its duration; in the same way, they, may, for just motives, prolong the duration thereof by writing whether for the same place, or for any other place in their diocese or under their control.*

(Signed,)

F. L. GATTI,
Vicar of the Holy Office."

APPENDIX III.

SPECULUM. R. C. SACERDOTIS EJUSQUE DISCIPULORUM.

Ecce ego ad te, dicit DOMINUS exercituum, et revelabo pudenda tua in facie tua, et ostendam Gentibus nuditatem tuam, et regnis ignominiam tuam; et projiciam super te abominationes et contumeliis te afficiam, ET PONAM TE IN EXEMPLUM, (*Nahum* iii 5,6.)

Maxima cum dubitatione trepidationeque ne, dum adultos cautosque, quorum est mores custodire et ecclesiam purgare, in secretam et nefandam rem introducarn, juvenibus et imperitis occasionem ad se polluendos nolens praebeam, hic nonnulla e plurimis transcripsi nefandis, quae a superioribus injuncta sunt Confessariis, i. e. iis qui-

bus demandata est animarum cura. Titulos librorum ex quibus excerpti quae sequuntur non subjicio, quia minime volumina haec pestifera in manum cujuslibet venire volo.

“Interroget se Sacerdos :—

An non sciens volensque in periculum perdendae castitatis se injecerit, aut graves tentationes sua culpa ipse sibi paraverit? An famae sacerdotali religiose consulens speciem mali vitaverit, nec, verbi gratia, frequentiori cum feminis, praesertim junioribus, conversatione, longiori et blandiori confabulatione (etiam in *Confessionali*) aliisque rebus suspicionem aliorum moverit? An nimium temporis in voluptate et delectatione, in epulis et compotationibus, in visitationibus, in otiosis itineribus insumserit, cum neglectu etiam graviorum officiorum? An immodicas et inutiles expensas faciat, et sine justa causa debitis se oneraverit? An ab omni fraude et mendacio abstinerit? An linguam solícite compescuerit, vitando multiloquium, nugas, confabulationes profanas, verba praecipue detractoria et inhonesta? An inter induendum (ad missam celebrandam) inutiles et jocosos sermones cum adstantibus miscere soleat? An cum modestia religiosa ab altari recesserit, vestes sacras non abjiciendo, sed reverenter exuendo, idque in silentio, nequaquam (horrendum dictu!) garriendo, jocando, ridendo cum adstantibus, dum Divinus Hospes in cordis penetralibus residet? An Simoniam circa Missarum stipes exercuerit, plures intentiones injuste contrahendo, aut ex stirpe recepta aliquid defraudando? An intentiones justo tempore persolveret, non nimis differendo, praecipue pro defunctis, pro felici partu, pro infirmis et moribundis?

An gravissimum confessarii officium haud neglexerit, interrogando de rebus necessariis, ut de scientia religionis, de vitiis hujus aevi dominantibus, et de iis quae persaepe reticere solent? An interrogando de rebus obscenis omnem curiositatem, immodestiam et imprudentiam vitaverit? An in feminis, praesertim junioribus, audiendis serium et gravitate plenum se exhibuerit?”

Quae sint res obscoenae hic intelligendae colligere potest lector ex alterius ejusdem farinae operis capitulorum titulis—“De Fornicatione; De Meretricio; De Incestu; De Clericis ad turpia Sollici-

tantibus ; De Pollutione ; An liceat gaudere de Pollutione inculpa-biter contingenti ; De Sodomia ; De Bestialitate.”

Alio in opere reperta sunt hæc foedissima. “ Interrogentur (fideles) de cogitationibus—num desideraverint aut morose delectati fuerint de rebus inhonestis, et an plane ad eas adverterint et consenserint ; deinde num concupierint puellas, aut viduas, aut nuptas, et quid mali se facturos intenderint. De his autem cogitationibus quibus assentiti sunt sumendus est numerus certus, si haberi potest ; sin autem exquiratur quoties in die vel hebdomada, vel in mense cogitationibus consenserint. Sed si nec etiam id explicare possint, interrogentur num concupierint singulas quae sibi occurrerunt vel in mentem venerunt ; aut num habitualiter turpiter de aliqua in particulari cogitarint, nunquam pravis consensibus resistendo ; et an semper illam concupierint vel an tantum quantum ipsam aspexerint. Demum interrogentur etiam num media apposuerint ad malas cogitationes exsequendas. Circa verba obscæna interrogentur—1. Coram quibus et quoties ita locuti sint ; an coram viris an feminis, uxoratis aut non ; pueris vel adultis ; 2. Quae dixerint verba, an, v. g. nominarint pudenda sexus a suo diversi ; 3. Num jactaverint se de aliquo peccato. Interrogentur etiam an delectati sint audiendo alios inhoneste loquentes. Circa opera interrogentur cum qua rem habuerint ; num alii cum eadem peccarint ; ubi peccatum fuerit patratum ; quoties peccatum consummatum. Se polluentes interrogentur etiam de tactibus impudicis separatis a pollutionibus. Item interrogentur an in actu pollutionis concupierint vel an delectati fuerint de copula cogitata cum aliqua vel pluribus mulieribus aut pueris.

“ Sacerdos. Sexennis septennisve mali aliquid commisisti ?—Discipulus—Fateor et frequentissime, pater.—S. In tua juventute habuistine pessimam consuetudinem te polluendi ?—D. Ita, pater.—S. Quot annis perseverasti in committenda tam gravi enormitate ? et quanta cum frequentia committebas illam ? quoties in mense aut in hebdomada ?—D. Ita, pater, semel a maledicto quodam socio hanc didici iniquitatem, nec unquam amplius emendatus sum. Oculorum tenus in hoc luto immersus fui, et ignoro an necesse sit ex-

plicare me illud septies vel octies etiam in loco sacro commisisse. —S. Quae vero a quodam tuo socio de hac iniquitate te edoctum fuisse dicis, necessario pariter explicare teneris, an simul cum illo, vos invicem excitando, hoc perpetraveris peccatum; nec non alios et quot tu similiter docueris; et an inter hos a te seductos aliquis tuus fuerit consanguineus. Insuper an primus fueris ad inducendum, et an cum aliquo ex istis sociis active vel passive Sodomiam commiseris, et quoties.—D. Ultimam speciem bestialitatis prænотatam decies vel duodecies in pueritia commisi. Insuper confiteor decem vel duodecim juvenes de malitia a me edoctos fuisse, alternatim cum omnibus quadragesies vel quinquagesies pollutionem committendo, et unus ex ipsis meus erat consanguineus, cum quo septies vel octies peccavi, et ego fere semper primus fui ad illos inducendos; immo cum tribus aut quatuor ex supradictis quindecim aut viginti vicibus nefandum commisi peccatum; cum uno septem aut octo mensibus quotidie conversatus sum, omni fere hebdomada peccatum committendo.—S. Post contractum matrimonium commisistine aliquando a te ipso peccatum pollutionis?—D. Utique, sed rarius, semel videlicet aut bis in mense.—S. Habuistine inhonestam conversationem cum mulieribus, ipsas tangendo vel osculando?—D. Cum multis utique mulieribus, nempe cum triginta circiter has nugas sepius exerceui, ipsas tangendo et osculando; et paucae effluerunt hebdomadae in quibus non talem commiserim errorem.—S. Ultra dictos tactus et oscula inhonesta habuistine aliquando copulam perfectam?—D. Ita, pater, cum quinque vel sex mulieribus habui copulam perfectam, ex quibus duae erant liberae, et cum ipsis peccavi viginti aut triginta vicibus circiter; tres vel quatuor erant conjugatae, cum quibus totidem circiter vicibus peccavi; cum una autem puella fui in occasione proxima septem vel octo annis; et quia in uxorem ipsam ducere cupiebam cum ipsa inhonestum fovebam amorem, eam quotidie visitando; quotidie tamen non peccavi ex defectu opportunitatis; sed bis tantum aut ter in mense cum ipsa copulam imperfectam commitebam, frequenter vero eam tangendo. Ad copulam illam induxi variis promissionibus illum despondendi; peractisque sponsalibus ter aut quater cum

VII.

ipsa peccavi, et, quod iniquissimum est, talibus peccatis inquinatus matrimonii sacramentum recepi. Post contractum vero matrimonium ter aut quater cum soluta peccavi. Duo insuper sunt vel tres anni quibus inhonestam habeo amicitiam cum ligata, cum quater vel quater in mense copulam habeo.—S. Quod nunc firmiter proponis non amplius domum illam adeundi nec amplius cum illa loquendi, et propter specialem dolorem quem sensibilibiter demonstras pro hac vice te absolvam.

A viris licitum est quaerere an in usu matrimoniali alias faeminas praeter propriam concupierint, et quot et quoties; an in dicto usu cum propria uxore servaverint vas naturale; an voluntarie semen foras effuderit, vel in evidenti periculo talem errorem committendi se constituerint. Cum mulieribus gradatim procedat sacerdos. Si namque mulier confiteatur se impuris cogitationibus consensum praebuisse, interrogari potest an in pueritia rem inhonestam cum pueris commiserit et in quali aetate. Insuper est interroganda an cum sociabus habuerit inhonestos discursus; et si aliqualis malitiae indicium praebeat, ab ea quaeratur an se ipsam illicite ob meram delectationem tetigerit; an cum delectatione protulerit vel audierit verba obscœna aut aequivoce nugatoria; an ad choreas pergens malitiose amosii manum strinxerit; an in locis secretis sola cum solo consisti consueverit, surgendo noctis tempore ad colloquendum. Si tandem poenitens lapsa est in peccata completa cum hominibus, interroganda est de abortu, an scilicet sit secutus vel solum attentatus; an foetus esset animatus, et quoties periculo se exposuerit abortum patiendi. Cum conjugatis qui nollent habere multos filios non erit superflua interrogatio an conjugibus occasionem dederint semen foras effundendi, aut saltem tale habuerint desiderium.”

*Beichte est fur dieser Zeit eine
erbärmliche CARNIFICINA gewesen.*

MARTIN LUTHER.

1517

50

mg

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

H&SS
A
4667

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW



D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 10 09 04 02 008 1